

THE HEART
OF THE CREEDS
EATON



Class BR121

Book .E3

PRESENTED BY

1889



THE HEART OF THE CREEDS

HISTORICAL RELIGION IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN THOUGHT

BY

ARTHUR WENTWORTH EATON

SECOND EDITION

NEW YORK AND LONDON
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

The Knickerbocker Press

1889

BR 121
E 3
1889

COPYRIGHT BY
ARTHUR WENTWORTH H. EATON
1888

Gift
Author
MAY 22 1920



Press of
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
New York

TO THE
CHERISHED MEMORY OF TWO WHO HAVE GONE FROM EARTH

MY MOTHER
ANNA AUGUSTA WILLOUGHBY HAMILTON
EATON

AND MY FRIEND
ELISHA MULFORD, LL.D.

I dedicate this book

PREFACE.

In my ministry I have continually felt the need of some book which, in a clear and concise way, should put before people the rational theology of the early Church and of the best thinkers of our own time, and in so doing set forth the undisputed religious principles which make the basis of the Creeds and Institutions of historical Christianity.

This book, which I have dedicated to her from whom I learned my first lessons of reverence for divine truth, and to the master of thought, whose friendship I was privileged to share in later life, tries to make clear the universal meaning in the rites and symbols of the historic Faith, since, before the Christian conscience can be delivered from narrow doubts and Christian society from strifes and divisions, men must learn to discriminate fairly between what is necessary and what is accidental in religion. Writing it I have had in mind, chiefly

the large class of young thinkers among the laity who, like myself, have often been sorely puzzled by the contradictions, and misled by the mistakes of popular theology, and to whom early Christian thought is little known.

There are books like Caird's "Philosophy of Religion," Mulford's "Republic of God," Maurice's "Theological Essays" and other writings, Munger's "Freedom of Faith," Prof. Allen's "Continuity of Christian Thought," Dean Stanley's "Christian Institutions," Hatch's "Growth of Church Institutions," and R. E. Bartlett's Bampton Lectures for 1888, which are accessible to all. In these books the scientific basis and broader aspects of religion are ably and fully shown, and in their scholarly and reverent teachings many thoughts here briefly indicated will be found in more expanded form.

BOSTON, Easter Week, 1888.

"Below the surface stream, shallow and light,
Of what we say we feel ; below the stream,
As light, of what we *think* we feel, there flows,
With noiseless current, strong, obscure, and deep,
The central stream of what we feel indeed."

—MATTHEW ARNOLD.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I.—GOD	I
II.—MAN	21
III.—CHRIST	39
IV.—THE CREEDS	61
V.—THE BIBLE	83
VI.—THE CHURCH	103
VII.—THE SACRAMENTS	127
VIII.—THE LITURGY	153
IX.—THE FUTURE LIFE	177

“The supreme truths which speak to every believing heart, the way of salvation which is the same in all ages, the clear voice of God’s love so tender and personal and simple that a child can understand it—these are things which must abide with us, and prove themselves mighty from age to age apart from all scientific study.”—ROBERTSON SMITH.

“The deepest truths are always becoming commonplaces till they are revived by thought. And they are true thinkers and benefactors of their kind who, having thought them over once more and passed them through the alembic of their own hearts, bring them forth fresh-minded, and make them tell anew on their generation.”—Principal SHAIRP, “Culture and Religion.”

“Duty is to crush out fanaticisms and revere the Infinite, to cultivate the human soul, to defend mystery against miracle, to adore the incomprehensible and reject the absurd, to purify faith and obliterate superstition from the garden of God.”—VICTOR HUGO.

“Nothing can be worse than stagnation of thought. It was an unhealthy condition of things when all was taken for granted; when authority was invoked to stifle inquiry, and those who thought at all, thought only as their fathers had thought before them; and when within the limits of the Church, at least, every thing was supposed to have been settled once for all at the Reformation, or at the last revision of the Prayer Book. We can hardly imagine the case of a thinking person who is not also at times a perplexed or even a doubting person.”—Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, “The Christian Creed.”

“Thou shalt not heed the voice of man when it agrees not with the voice of God in thine own soul.

“Nature shall be to thee as a symbol. The life of the soul, in conscious union with the Infinite, shall be for thee the only real existence.

“This pleasing show of an external world through which thou art passing is given thee to interpret by the light which is in thee.”—Dr. O. W. HOLMES, “Life of Emerson.”

“It is a matter of perfect indifference where a thing originated; the only question is: Is it true in and for itself?”—HEGEL.

GOD.

“When the martyr Attalus, in the persecution of the Gallican Christians under Marcus Aurelius, was asked by his judges what was the name of God, he replied : ‘Ὁ θεὸς ὄνομα οὐκ ἔχει ὡς ἄνθρωπος.’”—EUSEBIUS, v., 1.

“Our Father who art in heaven.”—The Lord’s Prayer.

“One God and Father of all, who is above all and through all, and in you all.”—ST. PAUL to the Ephesians.

“For in him we live, and move, and have our being.”—ST. PAUL to the Athenians.

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.”—Nicene Creed.

“Thou, O God hast made us for thee, and our heart is restless till it rests in thee.”—ST. AUGUSTINE.

“It is said of Frances Power Cobbe that ‘one day, musing on the great problems of existence, she said to herself that, although she knew nothing of God or of any law beyond her own soul, she would, at least, be true to that and merit the approbation of her own conscience. This resolution brought her almost immediately a renewed faith in God.’”—*Westminster Review*, December, 1845.

“The conscience of man presumes the being of God ; it presumes a righteous being. There can be no adequate apprehension of conscience, nor explanation of the fact of conscience, that does not imply the being of God, and his relations to man.

“All that God is he imparts, he reveals. He is no more a distant being, that man cannot approach him ; he is not an inaccessible being, that man cannot find him ; he is not an unknown being, but what he is he has made known.”—MULFORD, “Republic of God.”

“Father of all ! In every age,
In every clime adored,
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.”

—POPE’S Universal Prayer.

GOD.

Belief in God is the fundamental article of every religious creed, the foundation stone of every theology. Throughout Christendom the people of all churches and sects are unanimous in saying: "I believe in God." But, to many persons, it perhaps does not occur that this fundamental tenet of theology is held with very great differences in the religious world. Within the Christian Church itself, professing to base its beliefs on the teachings of Jesus, and to hold, at least in essentials, a united faith, there have been great and important differences in men's conceptions of what God is. The changes in popular theology from age to age have, in fact, resulted chiefly from a growing reasonableness or unreasonableness in this fundamental doctrine.

In the same community to-day are often to be found churches from whose pulpits or chancels the teaching about God differs so

radically that we are compelled to define for ourselves with great care, separating between true and false in them, our own beliefs in Him. Especially is this necessary when we further see that sectarian strifes and controversies, those dark shadows ever lurking in the background of church life, are directly traceable to conflicting views of God. The sin most abhorrent to a devout Hebrew of ancient times was that of idolatry, the root principle of which was, as it ever is, a distorted image of God in the mind. And our own Litany, praying that men may be delivered from "heresy and schism," asks in that familiar petition that people shall be kept from false conceptions of God, since true ideas concerning Him have been at the bottom of all peace-bringing, elevating, spiritual faiths, false opinions at the bottom of all fierce and degrading theologies.

One of the truths concerning the Bible, that careful study of its various parts has made clear, is that the Hebrews did not, by any means, all have similar conceptions of God; that the popular theism of the Pentateuch, for example, is of a very much lower order than that of the later prophets; that Jesus, in His

day, held very different views of God from those of the chief theologians of Judea, among the Scribes and Pharisees.

Jehovah, to the earlier Hebrews and the popular theologians of our Saviour's time, was only one of the great national or tribal gods, greater and better than all others, but, like them, the god of one people, having many of the imperfections that the other Semitic tribes, the Moabites and Ammonites and Philistines, who lived near the Hebrews, ascribed to their gods. In their thought they conceived of Him as "a great, non-natural, magnified man," who created the heavens and the earth as an architect makes a house; who got angry, and changed His mind, and sent plagues on His enemies, and fought the battles of His subjects, performing stupendous feats in the sphere of nature in order to frighten the one or help the other. The prophets and others, on the contrary, often rose to the most exalted planes of thought about God. "Canst thou, by searching, find out God?" they say. "Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than hell, what canst thou know?" "For thus

saith the high and lofty One, that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy ; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him, also, that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones."

Such passages as these, from the Books of Job and Isaiah, show that their authors had risen far above the popular conceptions, in their thought of God, just as in their times Kleanthes and Plato and other great Greek writers rose far above the popular mythology of their country. But the Hebrew idea of God was most fully exalted and spiritualized by Jesus, and after him St. Paul, who taught that God was not a changeable deity, made in the likeness of man, but the unchanging spiritual life of the universe, and the Father of all mankind. "God is a Spirit," Christ said to the woman of Samaria, when she spoke to Him about the conflict between the Hebrew belief that true worship could be performed only at Jerusalem, and the Samaritan belief that Mt. Gerizim was the proper place for it,—“God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and in truth,” thus refusing to

localize the Divine Presence, or limit the communication of the Divine Spirit.

St. Paul, at Athens, a little more than thirty years afterward, uttered these eloquent words, in exactly the same spirit and meaning: "God who made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands. Neither is He served by the hands of men, as though he needed any thing; for it is He that giveth unto all life and breath and all things. And He made of one blood all the nations of mankind, to dwell upon the face of the whole earth; and ordained to each the appointed seasons of their existence, and the bounds of their habitation. That they should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He is not far from every one of us; for in Him we live and move and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said: 'For we are also His offspring.'"¹

The views of God held and taught by Jesus and St. Paul were indeed spiritual and pro-

¹ This quotation is from Aratus, a Greek poet, like St. Paul himself a native of the province of Cilicia.

found, but all their followers, the new converts to Christianity, did not share in them. Side by side in the Christian Church grew up two entirely distinct sorts of theistic belief : one crude and anthropomorphic, like the earlier Hebrew, or Greek polytheistic belief ; the other profound and philosophical, like the thought expressed in the passages quoted from the Gospel of St. John and the Book of the Acts of the Apostles.

In the minds of one set of thinkers was firmly rooted the Oriental idea of God as a great, man-like being living far away from the world, controlling it through intermediate agents, much as the Czar of Russia controls that part of his empire which lies across the Ural Mountains. As theology became more of a science in the Christian Church, this view of God as an absolute monarch, made in the likeness of an earthly despot, took on more definiteness, and from it, by a natural process, in the Western world, sprang the Augustinian or, as we know it better, Calvinistic form of the leading Christian doctrines—Divinity of Christ, Trinity, Atonement, Heaven and hell.

In the Calvinistic thought, the world was a lifeless machine moved by the will of a Super-

human Being, who never came near it. Man also was His creation, but the relation between him and God was no more than that between the clay pitcher and the potter who moulds it. Revelation was not to be sought in the better instincts of humanity, and the process of history, in philosophy and poetry and art, but merely in certain utterances of the few *inspired* Hebrews and Christians who wrote the books of the Bible. The proof of God's interest in the world lay not in His continuous renewal of its life, and in the increase of moral and intellectual power among men, but rather in certain interferences with the regular working of events, called miracles. Christ was not the highest expression of the great universal fact of incarnation, "God's idea of man completed," but an incongruous being, neither God nor man, and yet both.

The doctrine of Trinity was not the summing up under the symbol of three-foldness of all the great attributes of God which have their root in His eternal personality, the brief expression of all the highest philosophy concerning the relation between the divine and the human, God and His creation, but rather a division of the

infinite God into three finite personalities in some measure antagonistic to each other. The Atonement was not the realization in humanity once for all, in Christ, of perfect righteousness, the one complete exhibition of sacrifice, but rather, as with the heathen, the propitiation by means of literal blood of a vengeful and deeply outraged deity. Heaven and hell were not progressive states of mind and feeling, conditions of the inner life consequent upon obedience or disobedience to natural law, but rather places of physical delight or torture, into which, at death, for their good deeds or bad deeds, men were arbitrarily put by their Creator. Law itself was not the eternal expression of the life of the universe, so much as the fiat of a despotic will.

That was one, and because it requires less grasp of intellect, and through the middle ages was most in harmony with the imperial temper and aims of the Church, it became after the fourth century the popular view of God, and His relation to the world. But there was another and better theology prevalent during the first four centuries of the Christian era, which is commonly termed the conception of God as

“immanent in the world.” It is a conception that has never been lost, even in the crudest and darkest times of religious thought, and now that the intellect of man, released from the fetters that bound it when the mediæval or Calvinistic theologies held sway, is free to approach all the sources of divine knowledge, to find in arguments unrecognized in other days its strongest proofs of God, belief in God as the indwelling Life and Power of the Universe, Soul of all things, Omnipresent Spirit, Source of strength and order, Fountain of beauty, “Light of Light,” who dwelleth on high, and humbleth himself to behold the things that are in heaven and in the earth, is necessarily coming to supplant the other view. In the better conception God is not a person in the sense in which we are persons; not as Michael Angelo painted Him, a marvellous man “with the brow of Jove and the lightning in his grasp”; but the Great Spiritual Life, who robes Himself in a world-vesture, and faintly yet truly reveals His noblest attributes, His divine character in the personality of man. In the third chapter of Exodus there is a profound passage in which God is said to have told Moses, when he asked

what name he should call Him by, that His name was simply "I am," meaning that God is too great to be understood by men, or named in human language. "I am that I am!" And we shall probably never get much nearer an adequate description of God, than our English Churchman, Wordsworth got, in his "Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey," where he says so profoundly that God had revealed Himself to him as,

" A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts ; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man :
A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things."

Tennyson, in his little fragment called " The Higher Pantheism," writes :

" Speak to Him thou for He hears,
And spirit with spirit can meet ;
Closer is He than breathing,
Nearer than hands and feet."

And his lines breathe much the same spirit as those words in the thirtieth chapter of Deuteronomy, used also by St. Paul in the Epistle to

the Romans : “ For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven that thou shouldest say : Who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say : Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it, and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.” Even Pope writes :

“ All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body nature is, but God the soul ;—
To Him no high, no low, no great, no small,
He fills, He bounds, connects, and equals all.”

And Emerson says :

“ Draw, if thou canst, the mystic line
Severing rightly His from thine ;
Which is human, which divine ? ”

Thus the incarnation is a process having its highest point in the Christ ; the Trinity is the doctrine, first, of God as unrevealed and unrevealable, God in the great unfathomableness of His being, God the Father ; second, God as immanent in nature and in humanity, God as

the reason or light of all men, the Son who binds together all things, temporal and eternal, human and divine; third, God the Sustainer and Living Spiritual Power of the visible universe and of man its noblest member, God the Holy Spirit. Revelation, in its largest sense, is to be sought in the long process of history and the life of man. The Atonement, typically wrought out in the historic Christ, is the reconciliation of the spirit of man with the highest truth, with God. Heaven and hell are ever advancing conditions of the soul in this world, and all worlds where men may be.

The former view of God prevailed in the Western Church during the Middle Ages, and indeed has lasted to our own day, and this fact is largely attributable to the influence, first, of Tertullian, and then of the Latin father Augustine, who was converted to Christianity in the year 387, but whose mind never lost the unhealthy tone it had received from the Manichæan philosophy to which, for nineteen years, between the ages of twelve and thirty, he had given his allegiance. Certain parts of our Prayer Book bear the impress of Augustine's thought, the Litany perhaps showing it most of

all. But the oldest parts of the Prayer Book, and especially the so-called Apostles' Creed, which we say every Sunday, the universal creed of Christendom, were made under the influence of the larger and freer and more rational theology of a time nearer to Christ and the Apostles than the fourth and fifth centuries when Augustine lived and wrote. The chief representatives, in the early Church, of this theology are the much more profound and rational thinkers, Clement and Origen, whose thought illustrates what is known as the Alexandrian theology, and Athanasius, who has always in the history of doctrines borne the name of "The Father of Orthodoxy."

These, in brief outline, are the two forms of belief about God that have prevailed in the Christian world, and their histories. The Augustinian theology has hitherto colored most of the religious thought of this continent, but with the increase of independent thought and study, the older and better and more truly orthodox form of theology of the Alexandrian fathers of the Church is returning, and in intelligent and broadly thinking quarters, is fast sup-

planting the cruder form of religious belief that has prevailed.

This older, more rational view of God, as everywhere present in the world, is sometimes felt to be too vague and obscure for ordinary minds to grasp, but the truth is, God is so great that when we think most truly about Him, we are least able to express our thought. It was the exceeding poverty of the other view of God that made it possible to think definitely of Him as a great man sitting on a throne in the distant heavens, whence He issued laws to men. All our language about Him is figurative. He has no material form, no jewelled throne above the sky, no literal judgment-book open before him. He dwells everywhere; His throne is the eternal order of the universe; His reign the supremacy of law and love; His judgment-book the conscience of the race. We cannot make adequate theologies; our best thought comes so far below the great reality, and our richest language is so poor. We can speak of God only in figures and poetically, and we must always beware of mistaking this figurative language for scientific or precise description. It is this mistake that has led the Church, when the

Augustinian theology has prevailed, into persecutions and cruelties innumerable, while the Alexandrian theology has generally fostered a spirit of peace.

Yet, in conceiving of God as everywhere present in the universe, creating, renewing, inspiring, life of our life, inspirer of our best thoughts and deeds, we are not Pantheists. Pantheism confounds God with His creation; Christianity has always maintained as carefully the *transcendence* of God as His *immanence*. He is in all things; and yet the highest and most essential truth concerning Him is that He is a Personal God. But his Personality, which is the root and source of our own, His mind and affections, of which ours are but "broken lights," are not limited like ours. All that we know of reason and right emotion in man we may think of as existing in unlimited fulness in God. All that we can fathom of the mystery of human souls we may regard as existing infinitely in Him from whom human souls come forth.

One question more some minds will be glad to have touched upon in this chapter, the very important question as to the proof that God

exists at all. In the old New England theology this would have been the first thing to settle in a chapter treating of belief in God ; but we have entirely given up trying to prove God's existence from the mere abstract propositions of thought, or from the observed sequence of nature, or fitness of means to ends, or from any thing outside our own souls, and are simply and confidently willing to assume His existence in all we say or do. The highest proof of God's existence is the fact that we are able to think of Him at all, as the strongest and most convincing argument for immortality is the fact that we are able to conceive of immortality. The human soul is both finite and infinite, both human and divine, and we cannot by any exercise of the mind ever help believing in God. His personality is the source of our personality, His thought the source of our deepest thought. "In Him we live and move and have our being," and instead of going to books for arguments for His existence, we must obey the injunction of an old seventeenth century divine of our Church : "*Intra te quaere Deum :*" *Seek for God within thine own soul.*

The injunction to seek for God within one's

own soul, seems to some persons very vague and unsatisfactory. They prefer to be told to seek Him in something He has done or is declared to have done outside of themselves. It is true we should never forget to see God's revelation of Himself without us, in the world of nature, or in the record of the movements of human life and thought we call history. But the revelation of God in our own souls through the instincts of love, justice, sincerity, and reverence on which we act, and the voice of reason which always speaks within us, precedes any, however important, revelation without us. If men would habitually think not of what God has done, but of what their own souls, all the truth and reason within them, declare that He is, they would find the process of belief in Him strangely easy.

"The pure in heart may know God, but the critical understanding can never comprehend Him," says a modern English philosopher; and these forcible words were written near the close of the second century, by Theophilus, a bishop of Antioch: "If thou sayest, Show me thy God, I answer, Show me first thy man, and I will show thee my God. Show me first

whether the eyes of thy soul see, and the ears of thy heart hear. For as the eyes of the body perceive earthly things, light and darkness, white and black, beauty and deformity, so the ears of the heart and the eyes of the soul can see God."

Our own New England philosopher, Emerson, says, in his essay on the "Over Soul": "We know that all spiritual being is in man. A wise old proverb says, 'God comes to see us without bell'—that is, as there is no screen or ceiling between our heads and the infinite heavens, so is there no bar or wall in the soul, where man the effect ceases and God the cause begins."

Thus he gave us, and thus we must explain Jesus' great doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God. There is an eternal relationship between God and every created soul. The true laws of life are the laws of His life in us. Not only is belief in Him possible, but actual unbelief is impossible. When men are most questioning His existence, they are, often, most profoundly believing in Him. It may be truly said that scepticism never reaches the soul.

MAN.

“So God created man in His own image ; in the image of God created He him.”—GENESIS, i., 27.

“The Platonic view of the soul, as a spiritual substance, an effluence from Godhood, which under certain conditions becomes incarnated in perishable forms of matter, is doubtless the view most consonant with the present state of our knowledge.”—JOHN FISKE, “Destiny of Man,” p. 43.

“The divinity that stirs within us.”—ADDISON.

“If a person could be persuaded of this principle as he ought, that we are all originally descended from God, and that He is the Father of men and gods, I conceive that he would never think of himself meanly or ignobly.

“If what philosophers say of the kinship between God and men be true, what has any one to do, but like Socrates, when he is asked what countryman he is, never to say that he is a citizen of Athens, or of Corinth, but of the Universe.”—EPICETUS.

“Know thyself then the pride of His creation, the link uniting divinity and matter ! Behold a part of God Himself in thee ! Remember thine own dignity, nor dare descend to evil or to meanness.”—ANCIENT BRAHMINICAL WRITING.

“Every inmost aspiration
Is God’s angel, undefiled,
And in every ‘O my Father,’
Slumbers deep a ‘Here, my child.’”

“Man is the free, personal unity of spirit and nature. In every human individual there exists something unconditioned.”—MARTENSEN.

“Human thought cannot recognize itself as imperfect and relative without conceiving God as perfect and absolute. We see every thing in God.”—MALEBRANCHE.

“The aim of man should be to secure the highest and most harmonious development of his powers to a complete and consistent whole.”—HUMBOLDT.

MAN.

The central principle of Christianity, in opposition to some of the older faiths of the East, was the value of the individual. Christ taught that not man alone but men were the objects of the divine love and care. And in all His teaching concerning the human soul, He assumed in men not merely the capacity for knowledge of the divine, but actual possession of the divine nature, by which alone such responsibility in divine things as he attributed to man could be regarded as possible.

The Christian belief in mankind as divinely related, is so spontaneous, so fundamental to the best religious thought, that no theology making a contrary declaration has ever been able to shield itself from the charge of self-contradiction. Theology, to be consistent, must declare frankly, and take as its starting-point the doctrine of Jesus, that the deepest truth about men is that they are the sons of God.

Confusion regarding this fundamental truth inevitably results in confusion as to the meaning and the means of salvation, and the purpose of God in the establishment of His Church. And in this we have the explanation of much of the vagueness and uncertainty in matters of belief, as well as the conflict of opinions, that exists within the churches of the modern Christian world.

Most people have received from their teachers a double education in religious things. The Bible and other religious books sometimes speak so strongly of human unbelief and sin as almost to warrant the teaching that there is no natural relationship between the soul and God, but rather a great wall of separation, never to be removed; no closer bond of sympathy than among men exists between the ruler and his subjects. And such teaching is part of the teaching of popular religion.

But the view of these utterances which finds in them the foundation stones of a theology radically at variance with that in whose reasonable teaching that man is truly God-related we have all likewise been educated, is, of course, superficial and false.

In days when the world knew far less than it

does now of the value of charity, "the bond of peace," when instead of mercy and the sense of human brotherhood, despotic cruelty and disregard of private rights prevailed, it is not strange that a system of theology should have grown up which, so far as it was able, ignored the simple relationship of man to God, and on the Gospel of Jesus imposed a grim and unlovely structure of logic, or an artificial ritual method it called "the way of life." Two systems continually waging warfare against each other, the Sacerdotalism of Rome and the Calvinism of many Protestant sects, thus share in the radical error of a false view of man's fundamental relationship to the divine. Calvinism declares that man is not God's child, but merely the creation of His hands, in his nature completely at variance with truth and goodness :

" To all that 's good, averse and blind,
But prone to all that 's ill ;
What dreadful darkness veils our mind !
How obstinate our will !

Conceived in sin, (O wretched state !)
Before we draw our breath,
The first young pulse begins to beat
Iniquity and death." ¹

¹ Watts' Hymns.

Whatever we do or think before conversion, is necessarily wrong, since our whole nature is corrupt and wicked. At God's hands we deserve, not the treatment which children have a right to expect at the hands of their parents, but only wrath and punishment for the sins we have committed, or what is worse, the evil we inherit; and whatever of good He gives us is of His "free grace and bounty."¹

Romanism is built on the same perverted view of man and his relationship to God.

Teaching that man is estranged from God in every fibre of his soul it compels him to come under a system, like that of many heathen religions, in which a priesthood and sacrificial rites hold a prominent place, before he can properly be regarded as a child of God, an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven. So on the basis of its mistaken belief regarding man Calvinism has shaped its logic of regeneration, and justification by faith, and future reward and punishment; and on the same basis Romanism has

¹ The Plymouth Brethren, who represent the extremest form of Calvinism, refuse to allow "unconverted people" to use the Lord's Prayer. They do not teach it to their children, and they are at least logically consistent in not doing so.

reared its doctrine of salvation by means of the Church and the Sacraments, apart from which man must be left to the “uncovenanted mercies” of God.

The view of man implicity and in his direct teaching recognized by Christ, and afterward for many years common in the Church, was the simplest and most natural that can be held. Jesus had no theories of total depravity, and predestination, of substitutionary atonement, and justification by faith, or deliverance from God’s wrath by means of the Church and the Sacraments. He taught that in his deepest nature man is always the child of God, yet always needing light on his half-perceived relationship to his Father, always needing to have the springs of his soul purified, to have the way of duty made plainer to him, his moral obligations pointed out, his conscience touched and quickened ; in short, needing an education no teacher less perfectly at home with truth than Christ himself can give him. His parable of the Prodigal Son is an epitome of His Gospel, and in that the misguided and wandering sons of men are represented as living in a far country in moral filth and degradation, yet never for a

moment less truly sons of God than if they were living in the Father's house of truth and purity.

It is true He gave the world the important lesson of the new birth, but that meant the awakening within men of the deepest instincts and emotions, the opening of their eyes to see the beauty of divine truth and life as it was natural for them to see it. He sometimes spoke to people as every moral reformer has felt it necessary to speak, as if the world and sin had taken entire possession of them; and yet He knew that if righteousness was not deeper in them than sin, sense of God stronger than atheism, it was impossible that they could be moved by His exhortations. He assumed in His hearers a true and proper sense of divine things, a natural power to discriminate between the things that were for the soul's health and those which wrought in it decay and death.

When He called His first disciples from their fishing-boats or places of business, he did not tell them, in the Calvinistic way, that they must be regenerated and consciously converted before they could become His disciples, nor did He ever teach them that Baptism *created* men children of God. He treated them simply as

any true elder brother would treat his needy and dependent younger brothers, bade them go with Him, and let Him teach them about His Father, who was also just as truly theirs.

For a good while after Christ's death, the Church, in a simple, undogmatic way, held that simplest view of man's relation to God. Its teachers believed in the ideal nature of man, as well as the dark and sinful nature, the divine element as well as the human within him. They often quoted that passage in the first chapter of Genesis, which declares that man was created "in the image of God," and they understood by that, and by that other passage, in which God is said to "have breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life," that the soul has *God's own* life in it. It was only very slowly that the notion, that man by nature is utterly separated from God and lost to righteousness, came to prevail, and we can trace the steps by which, under the influence of the great Augustine, it finally came to overshadow the fresher and simpler teaching of Christ and the early Apostles and the Greek fathers of the Church.

Its origin is to be sought in an exaggerated

feeling of human sinfulness, and in a growing belief in the importance of the visible Catholic Church in mediating between God and humanity. The earlier theology said: There is no doubt that we are sinful, but the very fact that we know and feel our sinfulness, shows that there is a deeper and better self in us which allies us to Him who is the Source of all good. We are not utterly gone from righteousness any more than we are perfectly true to God. We inherit propensities to sin, and weaknesses of will that keep us from always doing right, but all our lives we never lose the conviction that our actual welfare is not furthered by doing wrong, nor that we are untrue to ourselves when we disobey the least of God's commands. And these commands of God embrace whatsoever conscience, instructed by reason, whispers within us that we should or should not do.

For confirmation of the Augustinian doctrine of total depravity, theologians of the Latin Church repeatedly turned to the allegorical story in Genesis of the temptation and fall, and taking it for literal history, traced all human sin to Adam, and made many strange assertions of the implication of all men in their

great forefather's guilt. Thus was shaped the dogma that still haunts the Church, and produces confusion in many thoughtful minds who see it lurking like a dark shadow behind the devotional words of certain parts of the Prayer Book, the dogma of original sin. "It was unknown," says Dr. Allen, "to Greek theology, as well as an innovation also in Latin thought, though it had been vaguely broached by Tertullian and Cyprian, and intimations looking toward it are to be found in the writings of Ambrose." And it led, both in its formation and after its irony had fully entered into western thought, to many bitter discussions and strifes that seem all the sadder when we remember Christ's simple teaching concerning man. With it is connected the view, once so common, but now generally discarded, that by the fall of Adam, death and all the sicknesses and minor ills that necessarily belong to man's lot were brought about. In it are involved many dark and dreary thoughts of God and the future, and by it the problem of evil, always insoluble, yet not so strange, if we regard the human race as slowly but steadily developing, intellectually and morally, from the beginning,

is unnecessarily complicated. To this doctrine, and the men whose minds it most strongly influenced, rather than to any, however oriental figurative language of the New testament, is chiefly to be traced the mediæval, Miltonic doctrine of everlasting punishment, a doctrine that once at least in the Prayer Book seems to find expression, where in the Litany we pray to be delivered from *everlasting damnation*; the words, however, having for us a deep spiritual truth and meaning.

How, then, in these modern days, when men are trying to look at all questions as the Christian thinkers of Alexandria did—fairly and in the light of reason,—shall we define for ourselves the doctrine of man's spiritual nature?

An old seventeenth century divine of our Church, Benjamin Whichcote, used to quote, very often, as expressing what he regarded as the true view of Biblical teaching and the view of reason, concerning man, those words from the Proverbs, "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord," thus affirming all that the best thinkers of the Church before Augustine had believed and taught concerning the divine relationship between the human soul and God. St. Paul

speaks feelingly in the seventh chapter of Romans about the conflict between good and evil desires that went on in him, and confesses, as we all have to confess, that he had not always strength to do right. But you will notice that he lays just as much stress on the good nature that dwelt in him as the bad, that he recognizes himself and all men as endowed with the two natures that he elsewhere calls the Adam and the Christ, the old man and the new. That struggle of St. Paul's is the common struggle of the race. The old man with his deeds, that is the lower, less perfect nature is daily in revolt against the new man, the higher and holier in us, of which Christ is the type and head. And so we, like him, are often made conscious by our own experience of the great double fact of our natures.

The divine nature of man is a frequent theme of great writers. In spite of this

“Muddy vesture of decay
That doth so grossly close us in,”

St. Paul, as has been said, recognized in man the movement of righteousness and freedom. And it was that that made it possible for him to

appeal earnestly, as he did, to the disunited and sensual people who composed the Corinthian Church, to regard their bodies as the temples of the Holy Spirit. It was that he meant when he said: "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, *and we in Him.*"

Emerson says: "We live in succession, in division, in parts, in particles. Meantime, within man is the soul of the whole; the wise silence; the universal beauty, to which every part and particle is equally related; the eternal One." "In all conversation between two persons," he says, "tacit reference is made, as to a third party, to a common nature. That third party or common nature is not social; it is impersonal; it is God." Again he says: "I feel the same truth how often in my trivial conversation with my neighbors, that somewhat higher in each overlooks this by-play, and Jove nods to Jove from behind each of us." And in Tennyson's fragment, "Flower from the crannied wall," where he says:

"If I could know what you are, little flower,
Root and all, and all in all,
I should know what *God and man* is,"

the same truth appears.

Caird says, most significantly: "The very consciousness of our finitude indicates that we have already transcended it. If we were wholly finite, we should never be conscious of our finitude. We could have no sense of imperfection, but for the presence in us of a standard of perfection."

The evil in man is testified to by every one, and so near at hand, so dark and dreadful is its presence, that it is not strange that it should so often have obscured the lovelier truth concerning man; that sin rather than redemption should have been the starting-point of the mediæval theology, and the Devil the destroyer, rather than Christ the redeemer, the hero of Calvinistic thought.

The problem of evil is one that has never been solved to the intellect, as evil itself can never be reconciled with the better self of man; but the more truly we know ourselves, the more sensible must we become of the imperfection in even our best thoughts and works. On the other hand, if we forget or refuse to reverence the divine light of human reason, the eternal rectitude, the infinite truth in man, we shall inevitably fall into false and querulous ways of thought concerning him.

The figurative account in Genesis of the fall of man, as of the creation of the world, used to be regarded as literal history. By that account people judged that man was created at first not only innocent, but complete in all his nature, and that in one moment he fell from a state of moral grandeur to one of moral degradation and blindness. This fallen nature he then entailed on his descendants, and so the evolution of the race has been downward, not upward.

That was the doctrine of the mediæval Church; but in the light of many truths that history and science have revealed, it is no longer generally believed. Whether man has been evolved from lower forms of life or not, there is every reason to think that he has risen from a very low state of intelligence and moral consciousness to his present condition; that in his whole history, as in the universe at large, the law has been, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." We do not now take the account in Genesis as literal history; we regard it as an allegory of the inward experience of every man. Men come into the world innocent, as to actual guilt, but with latent capacities for good and evil within them.

As life goes on, they eat of many a forbidden tree, and so fall into sin and sorrow, but, as in the story of Genesis, such experiences make them wise to discern good from evil, and perhaps help them to a noble final self-conquest.

To sum up the doctrine of man : In the light of the New Testament and the best subsequent Christian thought, we believe that the soul of man contains divine and human, infinite and finite elements. We do not hold sin to be a light thing, but we believe that righteousness lies deeper in us than sin ; that it is inwrought with the fibre of our being, while sin, as some one has said, is the dye, a very dark and dreadful dye, that stains the fabric of our life. And consequently, that, as Epictetus declares, "If a man could be persuaded of this principle as he ought, he never would think of himself meanly or ignobly."

Some may question whether this teaching is in harmony with that of the Prayer Book, but the teaching of the Prayer Book, like that of the Bible, is to be discovered rather in its general spirit than from isolated words or phrases. We must remember how simply and confidently the Prayer Book puts the Church's prayers into

the mouths of all men and women who will use them, assured that they express the deepest desires, the purest emotions of all human souls.

The system of the historic Church is one of rational religious education. She takes people in childhood, because they are children of God, baptizes them, teaches them to pray, confirms them, and makes them, if they will be, participants in all her life and worship, the very fundamental principle of her system being the double nature of man. The whole aim and end of her education is not to save men from the wrath of an offended Deity remote from them, but to bring into complete harmony within them the two natures now so often in fierce and bitter conflict. Looking beyond this world, she prophesies of worlds where we may grow more freely in light and knowledge, where seeing truth no longer darkly, but with clear vision, we shall love and follow it, and where, no longer torn by conflicting desires,

———“ Mind and soul according well,
May make one music as before,
But vaster ! ”

CHRIST.

“The incarnation was *historically* accomplished in Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered under Pontius Pilate.

“The inward Christ of the heart (of the Church and of each believer) presupposes the Christ manifested in history, and without the latter soon fades away into a mystic cloud.”—MARTENSEN.

“The Council of Nicæa, which declared the union of God with man, is one of the most important assemblies that was ever convened on this earth; it dates a new era in the history of human thought. God in actual contact with man—God in man and man in God—is the underlying idea of the Athanasian dogma, which asserts that the Son is consubstantial with the Father.”—Dr. F. H. HEDGE, “Ways of the Spirit,” p. 352.

“Passing from India to Persia, and thence to Greece, where in the hands of Plato it was made much of, the doctrine of the Logos became the prominent feature of the famous Neoplatonic school of Alexandria.”—“Keys of the Creeds.”

“The difference between the prophets and Jesus was, that he accomplished what they foresaw. His life full of faith in God and man, became the new seed of a higher kingdom than that of David. He was the Son of David, as inheriting the loving trust of David in a heavenly Father; he was also the Lord of David, by fulfilling David’s love to God with his own love to man; making piety and charity one, faith and freedom one, reason and religion one, this life and the life to come one. He died to accomplish this union and to make this atoning sacrifice.”—JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

“The revelation of and in the Christ is not a religion, and it is not a philosophy.

* * * * *

“The Christ does not come into the world as the founder of a religion, and this revelation is not set forth as an insti-

tute, or a system, or a cultus of religion.—MULFORD, “ Republic of God.”

“ It is rather His assumption of our nature in all its fulness, than his death alone, that the Fathers dwelt upon. He is the representative man, the second Adam, the head of the body, who recapitulates in Himself, as they are fond of expressing it, the whole human race, and imparts to them—a new principle of life, in whose death all die, in whose resurrection all are made alive. This is the great argument of Athanasius.” —OXENHAM, “ The Atonement.”

“ To believe in the name of Christ is to believe that no other approach to God exists, except through the same qualities of justice, truth, and love which make up the mind of Christ. ‘ Ye believe in God, believe also in me,’ is given as His own farewell address. Ye believe in the Father, ye believe in Religion generally ; believe also in the Son, the Christ. For this is the form in which the Divine Nature has been made most palpably known to the world, in flesh and blood, in facts and words, in life and death.”—Dean STANLEY (“ Christian Institutions ”).

“ The vital principle of the doctrine of the atonement is self-surrender. Christ yielded himself perfectly to the Divine Will, and so became the world’s redeemer.

“ All the Fathers agreed, as it were with one mind, that to Christ belongs not merely the limited importance attached to every historical personage, but that his person stands in an essential relation to the whole Human Race ; on this account alone could they make a Single Individual the object of an article of faith, and ascribe to him a lasting and eternal significance in relation to our race.”—DORNER, “ Person of Christ.”

“ Christ saves us by pouring into us his own life, which is love. When Christian love is formed within us, it has killed the roots of sin in the soul and fitted us to be forgiven, and to enter the presence of God.”—JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

CHRIST.

An old painter of the fifteenth century, Fra Angelico, used to paint the head of Christ on bended knee, and with corresponding reverence of mind the Saviour's life should be studied.

It may seem presumptuous, after nearly nineteen hundred years of conflicting opinion, to say that it is not hard to arrive at true conclusions about him ; and if the modern student were obliged to seek for his true character and relation to mankind amid the dense mists of scholastic opinion, or the strifes of ecclesiastical councils, it would be impossible to say it. The doctrine of Christ's divinity, if it be true, is to be discovered in far simpler ways.

Theodore Parker once said: "Above all men do I bow myself before that august personage, Jesus of Nazareth, who seems to have had the strength of man and the softness of woman,—man's mighty, wide, grasping, rea-

soning, calculating, and poetic mind ; and woman's conscience, woman's heart, and woman's faith in God. He is my best historic ideal of human greatness." How much such a confession as that reminds us of the simple-hearted, yet deep and ardent love for him, that inspired Christ's first disciples ! There is a great gulf between their faith and admiration and that of the men who composed the Council of Nicæa, which, in the year 325, established on a dogmatic basis the Church's belief in his divinity ; and this modern utterance of one who loved the undogmatic faith of St. John and St. Peter, but cared little for the formulated opinions of the bishops of the fourth century, carries us back to the first flush of the world's new spiritual day.

Two questions in this chapter demand our attention : first, the nature of Christ ; second, his work.

The Catholic Church, ever since the Council of Nicæa, has persistently declared her belief in the double nature of Christ. It was the denial of his divinity by the Arians that led to the Nicene Council, whose stormy vote decided that henceforth the Church should hold and teach the doctrine of his double nature. After

that council other sects arose denying his complete humanity, and although the echo of all such strifes has long since died away, many people are still in doubt whether Christ was both God and man. Can that question be settled rationally and beyond the sphere of mere theological assertion? Let us see. The Christian world to-day contains but two leading forms of statement concerning Christ's nature: that of the Catholic Church, to which we have referred; and that of the Unitarians, which is, in general, an assertion simply of his human nature. And in many minds there is an impression that the separation between the beliefs indicated by these two forms of statement, is as wide and deep as that between the beliefs of the Church and the Arians in the fourth century. This is not always true. The early Arians were people influenced by the current teaching of the East concerning God. Arius himself was bred, not in the Christian school of Alexandria, but in that of Antioch, a school tinctured with the Oriental view of God as remote from His universe and acting upon it only by means of intermediate agencies. In the Oriental view there was no point of contact

between God and the universe ; such a thought as that He was the indwelling life of nature and the personality of man, never for a moment entered into it. They had discovered no natural tie between the human and the divine, and so the idea of the perfect incarnation of God in Christ, to which the Alexandrian view of God as incarnate *in all men* logically and quickly led the Church, was impossible for the Arian mind to grasp. Thus the early strife concerning Christ's divinity was, in reality, a strife about the more fundamental doctrine of the nature of God. The Alexandrian theologians regarded God as immediately present in His universe, not in the uncommunicableness and entire profoundness of His nature and power, but as the *logos* or reason in which every human being shared. He did not exist in solitary greatness, but in complex and beautiful relationships. Reason in the intellect and goodness in the soul of man both testified to His abiding presence in the race. And when "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth," it was only in pursuance of the regular manifestation or revelation of Deity. God and man had never existed

apart, one "in heaven," the other "on the earth," except in figurative language, used to portray the respective greatness and littleness of divine and human attributes. Christ was the perfect type or head of the visible incarnation of God, the highest point in the divine communication to the intellect and heart of man. In him was that perfect union of divine and human of which the constitution of the world and man had always been prophesying. "He was the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." He had not alone the divine nature, else he would have been like those mythical gods whom the Orientals conceived of as sometimes walking the earth in human guise, and so would have taken the world back to heathen polytheism. He had not alone the human nature, else his appearance in the world would have destroyed the essential principle on which all true philosophy of the relations between God and humanity is based. He calls himself both Son of God and Son of man. He tells the Jews that no sign shall be given them but *the sign of the Son of man*; that is, that he had come to establish truth, not by means of "portent and prodigy,"

but by means of revelation in a person; that his mission was to declare the eternal, indestructible relationship between God and man.

In tracing the doctrine of God we have already seen how, after Augustine's time, the Oriental view of God as existing apart from the world, an awful remoteness, came to be generally held in the Western Church; and it thus becomes most clear that the doctrine of Christ's divinity would necessarily appear in the later theology, under an entirely different aspect.

As a matter of fact the doctrine of the incarnation, rich and beautiful in the Alexandrian theology, did harden soon into a cold and repulsive dogma closely allied to the older beliefs of the heathen in the appearance of gods on earth, the fruitful source of strife and division and cruel persecution in the Church. In the Western Church, Christ was not the perfect type of creation, the complete embodiment of the divine principle in man, the headstone in the temple of God's Incarnate Life, into which all are builded, but rather a mysterious being, who came to earth to declare judgment, and to ward off dreadful punishment from

a portion of the race by offering his body as a literal sacrifice to offended Deity.

This, briefly stated, is the doctrine of Christ that Calvinism has handed down to us, and who can describe the painful struggles of mind it produced, age after age, among those who more or less clearly perceived that it could not be harmonized with reason or the better instincts of the soul? Turn whichever way they would, in the direction of a natural and reasonable faith, they were confronted with such passages as: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life, and he that believeth not the Son of God shall not see life." And they said: "If in these passages *Christ*, or *the Son of God*, means simply the historic Christ, the divine man of Palestine, how can salvation be justly limited to belief in him, since millions of the inhabitants of the earth, before he lived and since, never heard nor could have known of him? And what does belief in him mean? Can it mean merely some particular belief about him formed in the mind, or submission to the laws and institu-

tions of the Christian Church?" These were questions to which the Mediæval and post-Reformation churches of Europe could give no answer satisfactory to thoughtful minds. It was clear that salvation, whatever it meant, could not reasonably have been made dependent on the opinions people held about Christ, nor on the administration of the external rite of baptism. There was always a lurking conviction that God could be just to man only by making well-being or ill-being depend on something man could do or refrain from doing, something that took far deeper hold on the roots of life than mere speculation concerning Christ, or an uncertain state of the emotions connected with that, or on baptism or the Lord's Supper. What, then, was the true belief in Christ that was so necessary to man? The answer would have been found, had people looked for it, in the writings of some of the most orthodox of the Apostolic and Church Fathers.

Justin Martyr's plain declaration was that "Christ is the Word of whom the whole human race are partakers"; that "those who lived *according to reason*" were Christians, "though accounted atheists," even as those who "lived

without reason were enemies" to Christ; and that each man of the heathen writers "spoke well in proportion to the share he had" of the *Word of God in him*. Clement of Alexandria had said: "The Son of God is never displaced; not being divided, not severed, not passing from place to place; *being always everywhere, and being contained nowhere; complete mind the complete paternal light*; the teacher who trains the Gnostic by mysteries, and the believer by good hopes, and the hard of heart by corrective discipline." "Christ is called Wisdom by the prophets. This is he who is the teacher of *all created beings* the fellow-counsellor of God, who foreknew all things." "There was always a natural manifestation of the One Almighty God among all right-thinking men." "He whom we call Saviour and Lord gave philosophy to the Greeks. He has dispensed his beneficence both to Greeks and Barbarians." "For the image of God is His Word, the genuine Son of Mind, the Divine Word, the archetypal light of light."

Origen had said: "Christ has given light and taught the way of piety to *the whole human race*, so that no one can reproach

him if he remain without a share of his mysteries."

This was the orthodox doctrine of Christ, in the most enlightened portion of the Christian Church, before the time of Augustine; and it is this to which the Church in our day is returning. In the largest sense *Christ* is the divine Word or reason or wisdom of God, manifest in the constitution of the universe, and most perfectly in the nature of man. He is that of God which we can comprehend, and by means of which we stand forever related to the unrevealed mystery of the Divine Nature. He is indeed the Mediator between God and man, not, however, as trying to win God over to our side, but as in his nature "the eternal logos of the world through whom the divine light shines into creation"; "the ground and source of all reason in creation, be it in men or angels, in Greek or Jew."¹

From such statements as these we shall at once see the necessity for the modern distinction between the *essential* and the *historic* Christ. The historic Christ, the God-man of Palestine, who was *born of the Virgin Mary, suffered*

¹ Martensen.

under Pontius Pilate, was crucified dead and buried, and rose again from the dead, was the perfect manifestation of the essential Christ incarnate from the beginning of the world. "Christ lives in the heart of the Church and of each believer," says Martensen, "but the inward Christ of the heart presupposes the Christ manifested in history, and without the latter soon fades away into a mystic cloud."

It would hardly be profitable to discuss, at length, the various theories that have been held in explanation or definition of the work of Christ.

Most of the theological treatises with which people are familiar, and many of the pulpits, teach an erroneous doctrine of what is called "substitutionary atonement," and it is this principle of substitution or *quid pro quo*, that enters into most of the mediæval and reformed theories of the work of Christ.

For man's sin, those theories declared, justice demanded satisfaction; outraged law must be vindicated; God's wrath must be appeased. Yet Infinite Love could save the victims, if it would yield itself to that which would, otherwise, relentlessly fall upon them. So love and

justice met in conference, and bargained that love, in the person of Christ, should come to earth and submit itself to the pains of physical death, in order to pay man's ransom.

No form of this substitution doctrine could possibly satisfy the minds of the best thinkers. The human reason revolted at the grotesque spectacle of a God at war with Himself, demanding man's utter ruin, yet willing to be pacified if some victim could be found to take the offender's place, and so bargaining with Himself, or with the devil, for men's salvation. And the question kept recurring how spiritual wrong could be atoned by physical suffering or, as in heathen sacrifices, by the mere shedding of blood? Or how the sufferings of Christ for a few brief hours could, by any possibility, be regarded as an equivalent for unending ages of torture too dreadful to be imagined, for the whole race, in the life to come? Yet this, in one form or another, was the doctrine that was almost universally preached and professedly believed in New England until about half a century ago, when a large body of thinking men, under the name of Unitarians, rose in revolt against it and the popular crude and un-

philosophical doctrines of Trinity, Divinity of Christ, and Heaven and hell connected with it.

After what has been said concerning the belief of the early Church about Christ's nature, it will not be necessary to show how far removed from early Christian thought this view of the atonement was. The New Testament writers, full of enthusiasm over their Lord and his divine work, seized all the strongest figures they were familiar with, in order to express what they felt of the value of his life and death, but they held no dogmatic theories of the sacrifice of the Son of God, least of all such theories as were imposed upon the Church in later ages by the Augustinian theology.

Nor among the Fathers of the Church, in the third and fourth centuries, can there be said to have been any well-defined doctrine of atonement, while, indeed, all believed profoundly in the sacrifice of Christ, and spoke rhetorically of his life and death as having been for man's redemption.

We believe that Christ redeemed the world, not by suffering a penalty that except for him man must have borne, but first, by revealing, in his own divine-human nature, the

fact of God's enshrinement in the universe and the soul of man ; and second, by realizing in history, once for all, the perfect union of divine and human, and so the ideal, that man had long been struggling for and hoping to see realized, of perfect life. The death from which he saved man was the spiritual blight of sordidness and sensuality and false beliefs. The salvation he wrought was the "liberation of the God consciousness" in men from the slavery to sense in which it is so greatly held. The sacrifice of the cross not only typifies, but is the great tide-mark of that eternal sacrifice of the lower to the higher through which the universe and the soul of man struggle ever upward toward perfection.

The word salvation is as often on our lips to-day as ever, but we mean now, by salvation, not deliverance from fiery tortures in the life to come, but the gradually increasing perfection of our natures in all worlds where we may be. We speak of the atonement of Christ, but we mean by that, not the satisfying of an offended deity by a dreadful offering of human blood, but the revelation of the light and freedom of the obedient soul, which came through

Christ. The redemption of the world, we believe, lies in the truth that "in him was life, and the life was the light of men." That "the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth." Thus we believe in Christ, not as man, but as *God-Man*, head and type of creation, eldest brother of all the great family of mankind to whom God has imparted Himself, liberator of the human soul, redeemer of the race from sin. We hold that in his divinity every one, however defective his philosophy may be, who, loving reason and goodness and faith, seeks the liberation of his own soul from sin, *truly believes*.

The obstacle to a frank avowal of belief in the divinity, or deity, of Christ has always been a mistaken conception of God. The best thinkers have never personified God as a great man and localized Him in the distant heavens. To them God has been ever present in His children and His works, and they have had no difficulty in thinking of Him as manifesting Himself preëminently in Jesus. We love and admire the flowers in our gardens, and feel that

they all reveal somewhat of that wondrous perfection of beauty that exists in God. But when one more rare and beautiful than the others unfolds its petals and spreads its perfumes lavishly abroad, we feel almost like worshipping that as a complete revelation of Infinite Beauty. When the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls Christ "the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of His person," or when St. Paul says that "he is the image of the invisible God," and that "it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell," we have a similar exhibition of feeling. It was not Christ in his single personality that kindled the fervid apostolic imagination to so a bright a glow, but rather Christ as "unveiling God in the world and in the consciousness of man," Christ in his union with other men, of whom St. Paul had elsewhere said (1 Cor. xi., 7) that they were "the image and glory of God."

On summer mornings as we watch the sun rise out of gold and crimson seas and mount proudly upward into the heavens "trailing clouds of glory as he comes," we understand how Tennyson could write, "God made himself an awful rose of dawn," for it seems to us that

He has wholly incarnated himself in that glorious vision. Lost in contemplation of the divine man who reveals to men not only their duty and destiny, but, in his oneness with them, their divine relationship, how natural to feel that he is *the image and glory of God*. As we stand face to face with him, how can we better express our belief in the one perfect human character, the man who alone of all men could truthfully say as he looked into his inner life, There is no shadow of evil on my soul, than to repeat his own words: "I and my Father are one."

In confessing our belief in the sacrifice of Christ, *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*, we are confessing belief in the subordination of the lower to the higher, the universal sacrifice once historically, sublimely, and fully witnessed in the life and death of Jesus in Palestine.

Thus there are to-day many who piously repeat the Nicene Creed who, judged by the standard of the oldest and truest orthodoxy of the Catholic Church, are farthest from belief in the divinity of our Lord; while there are many who never say the Creeds who, at heart, are the

strongest believers in the fact. A clergyman of the English Church once quaintly said : " Divine truth is better understood, as it unfolds itself in the purity of men's hearts and lives, than in all those subtle niceties into which curious wits may lay it forth " ; and there is the echo of the Master's own spirit in Whittier's lines :

" Call him not heretic whose works attest
His faith in goodness by no creed confessed.
Whatever in love's name is truly done
To free the bound and lift the fallen one
Is done in Christ. Whoso, in deed and word,
Is not against him, labors for our Lord.
When he who, sad and weary, longing sore
For love's sweet service, sought the sisters' door,
One saw the heavenly, one the human guest.
But who shall say which loved the Master best ? "

THE CREEDS.

“As the name of the Father represents to us God in nature, as the name of the Son represents to us God in history; so the name of the Holy Ghost represents to us God in our own hearts and spirits and consciences. This is the still, small voice— stillest and smallest, yet loudest and strongest of all— which, even more than the wonders of nature or the wonders of history, brings us into the nearest harmony with Him who is a Spirit,—who, when His closest communion with man is described, can only be described as the Spirit pleading with, and dwelling in, our spirit.”—Dean STANLEY, “Christian Institutions.”

“Christianity, though a monotheism, and a monotheism which has destroyed forever both polytheism and idolatry wherever it has gone, is not that of numerical unity. The God of Christianity differs in this from the God of Judaism and Mohammedanism. He is an infinite will; but he is more. Christianity cognizes God as not only above nature and the soul, but also as in nature and in the soul. . . .

“He is an omnipresent will as the Father, Creator, and Ruler of all things. He is the Word, or manifested Truth in the Son, manifested through all nature, manifested through all human life. He is the Spirit or inspiration of each individual soul. So he is Father, Son, and Spirit, above all, through all, and in us all.”—JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

“In the Apostolic Creed we breathe the atmosphere of fact rather than of doctrine, and surely if its witness is accepted in all its length and breadth and depth, it will be found to be not only a rallying-point for all who *love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity*, but also will supply the truest and most

powerful corrective for the errors and follies of our times."—
Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, M.A.

"In early Trinitarian discussions, we cannot mistake the presence of a yet higher aim,—that, viz., of bringing to distinct consciousness not only the unity of the divine nature, but also the living longing of divine love to impart itself; in other words, the effort to maintain both the *translucent* nature of God and his immanence in his works,—the former in opposition to polytheism and pantheism, and the latter to an abstract deism. So far such formulas have also their edifying side, as giving witness to the struggle of the Christian mind after a satisfactory expression of what has its full reality only in the depths of the Christian heart.—HAGENBACH, "History of Doctrines," vol. i., p. 270.

"To exist in relationship is the essential idea of God."—
Prof. A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., "Continuity of Christian Thought."

"God the Father is the ground of creation,
God the Son is the law of creation,
God the Holy Ghost is the life of creation.

"God the Father originates,
God the Son regulates,
God the Holy Ghost actuates.

"God the Father is Deity invisible,
God the Son is Deity manifested,
God the Holy Ghost is Deity communicated."

—Rev. H. V. D. JOHNS, D.D.

(Recently reprinted in the New York *Churchman*.)

THE CREEDS.

Close together in the Prayer Book stand two venerable Creeds, or short Confessions of Faith, which are used interchangeably in public worship,—the *Apostles'* and the *Nicene*. These two Creeds are always said to embody the substance of Christian belief, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church there is no standard of doctrine whatsoever besides them. The Church in England at the time of the Reformation, following the Reformed Churches of the Continent, adopted a code of thirty-nine articles, which have no doubt often hampered her progress and disturbed the consciences of her clergy compelled by law to subscribe them. The organizers of our Church, knowing that however unnecessary these articles might be, or however faulty in expression, still, like the Catholic Creeds themselves, they contained the substance of all true religious belief, decided to retain them in the Prayer Book as an historical document, not to

be formally subscribed by ministers or people, but rather to indicate the close relationship between the Church in England and America.

There seems no sufficient reason, as we regard them, why the broadest thinker should not feel able to subscribe them as a whole, but in point of fact they stand in the back of our Prayer Book as a witness to our spiritual descent as Churchmen, a document serving to remind us of the crisis the Church went through in the sixteenth century, and of the debt of religious freedom we owe the English Reformers.

The only doctrinal standards we have are contained in the two Creeds, the shorter of which, from a legend that each of the twelve Apostles contributed a clause, is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the longer, made in its original form by the Council of Nicea in the year 325, and afterward added to, the Nicene. The Apostles' Creed was probably formed by combining the various simple Confessions of Faith used in the Early Church by those who were admitted to baptism, and it came into general use in the Latin Church; while the Nicene, formed on the basis of an earlier Creed in use in the Church in Palestine,

and, much more than the Apostles', the product of speculative thought, became distinctively the Creed of the Eastern Church.¹ "But there is one point," says Dean Stanley, "which the two Creeds have in common. It is the framework on which they are formed. The framework is the simple expression of faith used in the Baptism of the early Christians. It is taken from the First Gospel, and it consists of 'the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'"

At first it was common to use simply the name of Christ in the profession of Christianity, but that was soon superseded by the Trinitarian formulary found in the twenty-eighth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew, and in the second century the latter became universal. The use of this formulary in baptism antedates all the discussions recorded in Church History concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, which, at last, in the latter part of the fourth century, became fully settled as a symbol or mode of expression of the belief of the Church. The history of these discussions is instructive, as

¹ The history of the origin of the Nicene Creed will be found in detail in Dean Stanley's "History of the Eastern Church."

showing how impossible it often is for people of mystical and speculative, and people of logical and practical tendencies of thought to understand each other. The heretics of that early time were often heretics simply because a different philosophical training had made it impossible for them to enter into all the subtleties of the thought of their orthodox opponents, while many of their persecutions were the result of the failure of the Church party to see the difference between religion and their peculiar thought about religion.

The doctrine of the Trinity is the framework of the Creeds, but it is not a doctrine originating with or peculiar to Christianity. Triads and Trinities belong to many of the religious and philosophical systems of earlier and later times, and the Trinitarian symbol of Christianity we may with little hesitation trace immediately to a Greek source.

The following paragraph from a little book called "The Keys of the Creeds" is very suggestive, as indicating some of the steps by which the symbol reached the early Christian Church.

"The School of Alexandria added a new Trinity to those already received in Egypt.

This new Trinity was based on an analysis of the functions of the individual man. Every living being consists of a trinity; the individual self; the mind; and the life . . . projecting the individual man into the ideal, and divesting him of limitations, the Neoplatonists presented their Trinity as consisting of three Persons, of whom the first was unity, infinite and perfect, but capable of generating existence. The second person was subordinate to the first, but was the most perfect of all generated beings. It was called the Intelligence, Wisdom, or Word,—*Logos*, a Greek term, by a happy coincidence signifying both *reason* and *speech*. The third person was the universal Spirit, Soul, or Life. It was only through the Word that God the Father could be known, as a man's mind can only be known through his speech. The Word was thus the interpreter or Mediator between God and man. The leading apostle of this philosophy was a Jew, named Philo, who was born about B.C. 30.¹ He was

¹ Philo lived in Alexandria, the most intellectual centre of the Eastern world, at the time when Christian doctrines were moulding, and there can be little doubt of the strong influence he and his school exerted on the intellectual spirit and form of early Catholic theology.

at once an enthusiastic disciple of Plato, and an ardent Jew after the pattern of the later and more spiritual type. His countrymen, growing in spiritual graces since the captivity, had long been familiar with the idea of the Logos, whom they personified under the name of Wisdom."—"Keys of the Creeds," p 87.)

However the number *three* first came to be used as a mystic or sacred number, its use as such is very ancient, and is intended to convey the idea of completeness. In Christianity it denotes the completeness of the nature of God and His relations with mankind, and so impossible does the ordinary mind find it to symbolize God under the figure of unity alone, and so naturally does the idea of completeness take shape as threefoldness, that there seems little probability, no matter how far or fast scientific thought may progress, that the Christian symbol of the Trinity shall disappear. Not more from regard for an ancient and venerable symbol, than from a sense of its value in keeping before the minds of men the largeness and richness of the divine nature and revelation, do Christian thinkers hold and value it.

This deeper and profounder significance of

the doctrine of the Trinity was felt by the Alexandrian theologians and by Athanasius, the great champion of Catholic orthodoxy. But in the Latin Church the doctrine soon hardened into what seems very like belief in three gods, and in the popular Calvinistic theology of New England there can be no doubt that a belief very nearly allied to heathen polytheism prevailed. The popular mind conceived of a God of justice, a God of love, and another God, subordinate to these two, on whom they both relied to carry out their plans. The Unitarian protestants, keenly alive to the outrage Calvinistic theology had done to the divine truths written in man's intellect and heart, yet blind to the evolution of religion, and the intrinsic value of the religious symbols Calvinism had either perverted or thrown away, and lacking the catholic spirit of the older churches of Christendom, cast this symbol aside as a sign of unenlightened thought, and from that time to the present they and their descendants have done without it.

So far from being a sign of narrow or mistaken thought, the Trinitarian symbol is undoubtedly a great help and stimulus to profound and rational beliefs concerning God ; and

even the Unitarian body, which in many places has outlived much of the aggressive spirit with which it naturally began, and has mellowed and softened with time, has quite ceased to protest against it.

The doctrine of the Trinity is the basis or framework of the Creeds, although the symbol is nowhere directly referred to in them. Saying them we confess our belief in God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and this is the sum of our statement of belief, for the latter clauses of the Creeds, which relate to *the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the Forgiveness of Sins*, are still further declarations of belief in the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Trinity. We believe in one God in three Persons; but what do we mean by the word *person* as applied to God? We clearly do not mean that God is a person as we are persons. A Being whose nature has no limitations, to whose attributes of thought and will there are no bounds, must be very far removed from us, with our imperfect thought and feeble power of will and many limitations. The personality of God, like our own, is based on conscious thought, intelligence, and implies the power to will, but

in God thought and will are perfect and complete. Yet God exists not in solitary infiniteness, lonely perfection of personality, but in self-manifestation, in relations. There are mysterious depths of being in Him that we have received only faint suggestions of, but if He existed in cold, abstract unity we could never know Him at all. He would forever remain to us the incomprehensible and unthinkable source from which all things proceed, never to be named nor known,—an Infinite Father, but an Infinite Silence as well. God cannot exist in absolute mystery. His nature requires self-revelation, and He has revealed Himself. Speech has come out of the Silence, and that speech, God's thought, the *Logos* (both reason and speech)—all of God that can be named and known,—is the Revelation of the Son. In humanity that revelation is most intelligible, most complete, and in Jesus, the Christ of history, it culminates, and at last is grandly summed up.

Nor can God cease to create. From Him continually comes forth creative and sustaining power. He causes death, and out of death brings nobler forms of life. *He hath created the heavens and stretched them out; He hath*

spread forth the earth and that which cometh out of it ; and still the creation drama ceases not, for He giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein. Along with the *speech* of God goes ever the manifestation of His *power*, which is the revelation of the Spirit.

Thus we have God in three persons or characters, back of and revealing itself through each of which, is the Divine Personality, the Infinite Intelligence. Back of the Silence is God, back of the Speech is God, and back of the Power is God.

Canon Liddon, "Bampton Lectures," p. 49, says: "That three such distinctions (having their basis in the Essence of the Godhead) exist, is a matter of Revelation. In the common language of the Western Church, these distinct Forms of Being are named Persons. Yet that term cannot be employed to denote them without considerable intellectual caution." The Latin word *persona*, as is well known, originally meant the mask or character the player on the stage assumed, but in time it came to denote an individual of a species. Thus, when it was finally used in theology to represent the original Greek word *hypostasis*, which meant not an individual

of a class, but a Distinction in the *Essence* of God, it could not fail to mislead. "The conception of species," Canon Liddon says, "is utterly inapplicable to that One Supreme Essence which we name God."

There are many aspects under which this threefoldness of God's nature, and so the doctrine of the Trinity which beautifully yet feebly tries to express it, may be regarded. Dean Stanley says that the whole faith of Natural Religion, the faith of the Natural Conscience, is indicated by the name of the Father; Historical Religion, or the Faith of the Christian Church, God in history, in man, and above all in Jesus Christ, by the name of the Son; and Spiritual Religion, or God in our own hearts and spirits and consciences, by the name of the Holy Spirit.

Wherever among men we find any sense of awe or mystery, any aspiration of soul after truth and goodness, any dissatisfaction with that which is low, base, vile, any—however feeble—groping after spiritual light, we have the revelation of God the Father. Wherever we find the human feeling of the brotherhood of mankind, wherever in men's natures, we see re-

flected the wisdom and strength and forbearance and tenderness of God, or find the spirit of loving, religious sympathy drawing people together in organized societies for worship and charitable works, we have a revelation of God the Son. Wherever we find men conscious of a power of righteousness within them, struggling to free their natures from captivity to sin, pleading with them to be true to duty, to follow charity and faith and patience, honesty and purity and love with all men; wherever in the Church we see a spirit of earnest faith that triumphs over false and narrow prejudices and keeps religious life in its true place, above form, we have a revelation of God the Holy Spirit. It would be hard to see how the world could do without either view of God. Dean Stanley says: "To acknowledge this triple form of revelation, to acknowledge this complex aspect of Deity, as it runs through the multiform expressions of the Bible, saves, as it were, the reverence due to the Almighty Ruler of the universe, tends to preserve the balance of truth from any partial or polemical bias, presents to us not a meagre, fragmentary view of only one part of the Divine mind, but a wide, Catholic

summary of the whole, so far as nature, history, and experience permit. If we cease to think of the Universal Father, we become narrow and exclusive. If we cease to think of the Founder of Christianity¹ and of the grandeur of Christendom, we lose our hold on the great historic events which have swayed the hopes and affections of man in the highest moments of human progress. If we cease to think of the Spirit, we lose the inmost meaning of Creed and Prayer, of Church and Bible, of human character and of vital religion."

In 1860, Charles Kingsley, who, with Maurice and others, was deeply distressed over the failure of the Tractarian leaders, such as Pusey and Newman on the one side, and the Evangelical leaders on the other, to point out the deeper principles and make clear the rational basis of religious thought, wrote his novel "Yeast." The book traces the intellectual and moral development of Lancelot Smith, a young Englishman, educated under Evangelical influence,

¹ When we say of Jesus "Conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried, and *went into the place of departed spirits*," we simply mean to declare our belief in the *facts* of his history whatever they are.

and now skeptical of his early mistaken opinions. At one of the crises of his life he is found in St. Paul's Cathedral talking with an Asiatic-Christian philosopher. "Who is He to whom you ask me to turn?" Lancelot says. "You talk to *me* of Him as my Father; but you talk of Him to men of your own Creed as *the* Father. You have mysterious dogmas of three in one. I know them—I have admired them in all their forms, in the Vedas, in the Neo Platonists, in Jacob Boëhmen, in your Catholic Creeds, in Coleridge, and in the Germans, from whom he borrowed them. I have looked at them, and found in them beautiful phantasms of philosophy—all but scientific necessities,—but——" "But what?" answers the sage. And Lancelot says: "I do not want cold, abstract necessities of logic; I want living, practical facts. If those mysterious dogmas speak of real and necessary properties of His being, they must be necessarily interwoven in practice with His revelation of Himself." Then the Christian philosopher says, in substance, for we do not quote the words: Have you not felt the necessity for an All-Father, the Father of Persons, and so Himself the source of personality,

the fulfilment of our fitful and broken dreams of power, wisdom, creative energy, love, justice, pity? Have you not always been conscious of the imperfections of your own, the common manhood, and in your own consciousness always been holding, perhaps unconsciously, to a perfect human ideal, a perfect sonhood, a perfect human expression of the God above and the God in humanity? And have you not, in all your failures to keep your life a perfectly united life, in all your ignorance, passion, want of will, in all the confusion and helplessness of your soul, felt the need of a Divine Spirit to unify and give order to that which was so confused and helpless?

The doctrine of the 'Trinity Kingsley means to say is just what we would find any such doctrine, full of vitality, and richly suggestive of all the deepest and tenderest in human thought concerning God and the soul's life in God.

As a matter of fact, the threefold revelation of God, having come to the world slowly and in the fulness of time, not only can never be lost, but belief in it is in no sense limited even now to those Christians who retain the Trinitarian symbol. Opposition to the symbol first arose

because its rich and beautiful significance had been obscured and hardened, but for this mistake the Latin Church and the Calvinists should be rather pitied than blamed, and it is clear that Christians of to-day are in no wise responsible for it. Therefore to keep up and apologize for divisions in the Household of Faith on the plea of an old-time abuse of the *doctrine of the Trinity*, is not only foolish but wrong. The cause of the breach between Unitarian and Trinitarian is no longer, what it once was, a radical difference of conception of divine things, for both have grown wiser and more enlightened in half a century, and both may now, if they will, worship with the same venerable forms and express their faith by means of the same time-honored symbols.

As to the doctrinal symbol of the Trinity, since every truly religious man is of necessity a Trinitarian, there is reason to believe that in time even it shall be restored to its wonted place in the regard of all Christian men. The fact that we now need to make clear to ourselves is that we all believe in God as Father, Son, and Spirit. Sometimes as we think about Him He appeals to us most in one aspect, sometimes most in

another, but from no thought of ours about Him is either aspect wholly absent. When we pray, it is with the sense of either His Fatherhood, His Sonhood, or His Spirithood present with us, and in our dark and sorrowful hours one thought or the other about Him is sure to give us peace. Sometimes we need to be awed with the majesty and mystery of God; sometimes to be soothed and cheered with the tenderness and patience and pity of God; sometimes to be quickened and strengthened with His indwelling Power. Sometimes we need to make clearer to ourselves not only that God is great and perfect, but that He is the source of all human greatness and goodness; sometimes to fix our minds less on theology and metaphysics than on homely virtues and homely tasks and the Christian courtesies and kindnesses that make life sweet and pleasant; sometimes to feel not the stirring within us of great powers, but the quickening of weak faith and desire for the right, and the enlightenment of darkened conscience.

All these thoughts and many more are enfolded in those richly suggestive, yet brief and comprehensive symbols, the Creeds of the

Church. When we use them, we must remember that they mean to express all the most true and inspiring facts of divine and human life and the relations between God and man. In the various parts of the Prayer Book, sometimes the prayers are addressed to the Father, sometimes, as in most of the Litany, to the Son, sometimes to the Holy Ghost; and this richness and variety in the devotional spirit of the Prayer Book is one thing for which we should most highly love and value it. The aim of the Trinitarian symbol itself is to keep religion from becoming barren or perverted, and, as with all religious symbols, its power to do this is the true measure of its worth.

THE BIBLE.

“The main thing for us is to ascertain the meaning to which the words (of Scripture) are ministerial ; and we are not to imagine that the sacred writers deceive us because they do not give us the precise words of Him whose meaning they desire to express. Otherwise we shall be like mere miserable catchers at syllables, who imagine that the truth is tied to the points of letters ; whereas, not in words only, but in all other symbols of the mind, it is the mind itself which is to be sought for.”—AUGUSTINE.

“Devotion to the letter is the counterfeit of true and implicit devotion to the sacred text.”—Canon WESTCOTT.

“Unto a Christian man there can be nothing more necessary or profitable than the knowledge of Holy Scripture, forasmuch as *in it is contained* God’s true word, setting forth His glory, and also man’s duty.”—“Book of Homilies.” (See also the sixth of the thirty-nine articles.)

“There is nothing in the Vedas, nothing in the Avesta, nothing in the sacred books of Egypt, or the philosophy of Greece and Rome, which so unites the grandeur of omnipotence with the tenderness of a father toward his child (as the Hebrew Psalms).

“These Psalms express the highest and best moments of Jewish life, and rise in certain points to the level of Christianity. They do not contain the Christian spirit of forgiveness, nor that of love to one’s enemy. They are still narrowed to the range of the Jewish land and nation, and do not embrace humanity. They are mountain summits of faith, rising into the pure air and light of day from hidden depths, and appearing as islands in the ocean. They reach, here and there, the level of the vast continent, though not broad

enough themselves to become the home of all races and nations."—JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

"That the prophets and apostles taught under the influence of the Holy Spirit, was the universal belief of the ancient church, founded on the testimony of Scripture itself. (See II. Tim. iii. 16, II. Pet. i. 19-21.) But this living idea of inspiration was by no means confined to the written letter. . . . All, however, insisted on the practical importance of Scripture, its richness of Divine wisdom clothed in unadorned simplicity, and its fitness to promote the edification of believers."—HAGENBACH, "History of Doctrines."

"Few heresies have done more to mislead than the statement made by the assembly of divines at Westminster, that the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him."—GAIL HAMILTON in the *Christian Union*.

"A book let down out of the skies, immaculate, infallible, oracular—this is the traditional view of the Bible.

"In the name of religion let it die !

"Then there will be a resurrection, and the Bible will live again, clothed in a higher form for our most rational reverence. All that ever made the Bible a Sacred Book lives on to-day, and will live on while these books exist. Holy men of old spake as they were moved of the Holy Ghost. They were most truly inspired. The Biblical writers recorded a real revelation. These books hold for us the works of God. The Word of God speaks to us in the person of Jesus Christ."—R. HEBER NEWTON.

“ With reference to things in the Bible, the question whether they are genuine or spurious is odd enough. What is genuine but that which is truly excellent, which stands in harmony with *the purest nature and reason*, and which even now ministers to our highest development? What is spurious but the absurd and the hollow, which brings no fruit—at least, no good fruit? ”—GOETHE.

“ *The soul* is the perceiver and revealer of truth. We know truth when we see it, let skeptic and scoffer say what they choose. Foolish people ask you, when you have spoken what they do not wish to hear, ‘ How do you know it is truth, and not an error of your own? ’ We know truth when we see it, from opinion, as we know when we are awake that we are awake.

“ We distinguish the announcements of the soul, its manifestation of its own nature by the term *Revelation*. These are always attended by the emotion of the sublime. For this communication is an influx of the Divine mind into our mind. It is an ebb of the individual rivulet before the flowing surges of the sea of life.

“ Revelation is the disclosure of the soul.”—EMERSON,
“ The Over-Soul.”

“ The Gospel doth not so much consist in verbis as in virtute.”—REV. JOHN SMITH.

“ In the first Gospel we have narrative ; in the second, memoirs ; in the third, history ; in the fourth, dramatic portraiture.”—BISHOP ELLICOTT.

THE BIBLE.

The importance of right views of the Bible can hardly be overstated when we remember the part that Book has played in the history not only of religious beliefs but of Christian civilization. A careful discussion of any one of the Sacred Writings that compose it would be impossible in this brief chapter; we must rather limit ourselves here to a general statement of the Bible's worth, and of the reasons for the pre-eminence it holds and must ever hold in literature.

Every great Religion has produced its Bible or collection of Sacred Books, most of which are now to be found in our libraries, printed in English. If we want to know whence the Chinese religionists draw their inspiration, we must turn to the Sacred Books edited by Confucius in the sixth century before Christ and to those compiled after his death by his disciples. If we would find the source of the religious in-

spiration of the people of India we must open the Vedic writings, the Sacred Books of Brahmanism, the oldest of them dating back perhaps two thousand or more years before Christ; or to the Buddhist Scriptures, with their threefold division, compiled in the sixth century B.C., just after the Buddha's death. If we are studying the history of Persia, we shall be charmed with many a passage in the Avestas, the liturgical books of the Zoroastrian Religion. If we desire light on the complicated religion of the most deeply religious nation of antiquity, the Egyptian, we shall have to turn to the five classes of Egyptian Sacred Books, composed several thousands of years before Christ. The Greeks had their Orphic writings, the Teutonic and Scandinavian Religion had its Eddas, the Mohammedans have their Koran, and the Jews, belonging to the Semitic race, had, and wherever they are found still have, their Sacred Books, which, grouped together, we call the Old Testament.

In our English Bible there are thirty-nine of these Hebrew books, but in the Hebrew compilations certain books were united so that there were but twenty-two or twenty-four, and

these the Jews divided into three classes, which they called the Law, the Prophets, and the Sacred Writings, or the Psalms.

These three classes of Sacred Books differ widely in the purpose of their composition, as well as in authorship and date, and while some of them bear unmistakable traces of the times when they originated, the history of others is not yet sufficiently determined to enable us to say with certainty when they received their final shape. In modern days these writings have been viewed entirely without perspective—history, prophecy, and poetry alike. Any statement from the Bible has been treated just like any other, people forgetting to ask when and how the idea embodied in the statement arose, or by what peculiar circumstances it was colored.

In reality, these Sacred Books comprised the national literature of the Hebrews, some of them embodying their history, or supposed history, some the best thoughts of their poets, and some expressing the lofty moral sense and elevated spiritual conceptions of that unique body of men, their Prophets. Nor are the books that have reached us the only ones the Hebrews had. In certain portions of the Old Testament

there are incidental references to such books as the Book of the Wars of the Lord, the Book of Jashar, and the Annals of the Kings of Israel and Judah, all lost before our Saviour's time, yet all, no doubt, of equal interest historically, poetically, or spiritually, with those preserved.

The writing of this mixed collection of Hebrew books covers a period of somewhere about sixteen hundred years, the earliest of them, according to tradition, tracing to the time of Moses, the latest to the time when Nehemiah was governor of Judea in 420 B.C., and in them we find reflected all the different phases of Israel's life and culture and the vicissitudes and changes that successive generations had to record. The early traditions of their origin, such as every nation of antiquity had, are here to be discovered. Their descent from Abraham is recorded, their slavery in Egypt, the beginning of their national life under Moses, their settlement in Palestine, their history as a republic, their history as a monarchy, their conquest by a foreign power, and the subsequent restoration to them of independence. Besides this, we have here the lofty moral utterances of their prophets, a body of men who, in successive generations,

appeared as reformers of the popular religion, which too often degenerated into a system of merely external observances; and we have a large collection of lyrical psalms, whose best parts are so catholic that, although composed "long before the foundation of Rome and before the time of Homer," they are still in use in Christian worship all over the world, and are "in every age a fresh spring of hope."

Extending over so long a period, we should naturally expect to find reflected in these writings a great variety of religious views and states of mind. The Hebrews, even with their marked genius for religion, a genius similar to that displayed by the Greeks for art and by the Romans for administration, never long remained stationary in matters of religion. From age to age their religious conceptions changed, even as their ritual took color successively from the observances of the national religions of Egypt and Assyria. And in the same age, widely contrasting views and differences, as between the spiritual theology of the prophets and the grossly material theology of the priests, are often to be found.

The theory of the Bible that has prevailed

among us has not left room, even in the Old Testament, for differences of religious opinion, much less for inaccuracies or mistakes in historical or other matters. But the Old Testament makes no such claim of infallibility for itself. It simply claims to be the national literature of a people, with the very texture of whose organized life a deep religious sense is interwoven. It records their changing and sometimes contradictory views concerning God and man. It gives expression to a thousand lofty sentiments that the Divine Spirit has enkindled within them. It voices the universal hope and aspiration of religious souls, and puts words of penitence and trust into the lips of the sinning and sorrowing.

“ Out from the heart of nature rolled
The burdens of the Bible old ;
The litanies of nations came,
Like the volcano's tongue of flame,
Up from the burning core below,—
The canticles of love and woe.”

Of the whole Bible Dr. Mulford says : “ It embraces the most varied forms of literature ; as genealogies, laws, histories, records of legislative and judicial procedure, methods of sanitary, civil, and military administration. There is legend

and myth ; there are various forms of poetry : the ode, as in the antiphone of Moses and Miriam ; the drama, as in the Book of Job ; the idyl, as in the Song of Solomon ; the lyric, as in the Book of Psalms and the opening pages of the Gospel of St. Luke ; and in the writings of St. Paul citations from the Greek comedy, as from Menander.

“ There are traces in these writings of the races, countries, and ages in which they appeared, and of climatic conditions, with respect to languages and customs and laws. There is a popular element, as in the stories of Samson and Ruth ; and there is also a priestly and a kingly element, as in the books of the Chronicles and Kings. In some books there are traces of reflective phases of thought, as in the Book of Ecclesiastes ; and in some there are traces of Asiatic forms and Asiatic institutions.”

In short, the Old Testament writings must be studied with the same care as other books, and the laws of literary and historic criticism must be applied to them as searchingly as to the literatures of other ancient peoples. Allegory and legend must be carefully distinguished

from straightforward narration; prophetic rhapsody and fervid poetry must not be forced to yield what is technically known as doctrine. And above all the meaning of *inspiration* must be clearly defined.

When we come to the New Testament writings, of which there are, in all, thirty-seven, we find that the conditions under which they have been produced are somewhat different from those under which the various books of the Old Testament have come to be. They were produced in Palestine amid the new religious enthusiasm enkindled by the life and teachings of the Messiah, whose advent indeed made the dawning of a new day for men.

As Sakya Muni (the Buddha) arose in India, in the seventh century before Christ, to reform the popular religion, so Jesus came in Palestine to reform not only the Hebrew, but all religious faiths. Foretold by the prophets, who, whatever we may think of their other predictions, certainly foresaw the Messianic times and the more spiritual religion that the Christ should bring, at last the Sun of Righteousness arose "with healing in his wings," *the Word became flesh and dwelt among men, full of grace and*

truth, and they beheld his glory, and were inspired with love for the life in God and for him who taught the simple way of life. Out of this inspiration were born the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles, and the few remaining books that compose the New Testament.¹ There are interesting questions connected with the writing of each of them; date and authorship are not in every case fully known, nor can we tell the changes that have come upon them in course of transcription. But such matters are not vital. We know from the New Testament that Jesus lived, and that he preached faith in God and man, and taught that self-renunciation, striving after the ideal, is the true *way of life*, and that at last he died for his principles, and so dying, gave his life for the world; all else in the records being incidental, and of comparatively little importance to faith.

¹ The twenty-seven books which compose the New Testament are not all the Sacred Writings known to the early Church. The Gospel of Nicodemus, the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas were read in many churches and held in equal reverence with the books comprised in our Canon; while for a long time the right of the 2d and 3d Epistles of St. John, the Epistles of St. James, St. Jude, and the 2d of St. Peter, and the Book of Revelation to be regarded as Scripture was greatly disputed.

As in the case of the Old Testament writings, the true significance of these Epistles and Gospels was not at first obscured by superstitious reverence of any sort. But, as happened in later ages with the Hebrew writings, and as indeed has happened with the Bibles of all faiths, there came a time in the history of Christianity when what was written, as most books are written, with simple integrity and true purpose, and with common desire to impart to others truth that men had received, came to be regarded as given supernaturally by God. Inspiration is a figurative term, which means divine inbreathing, or movement of the spiritual forces of the soul, but in later Christian times, and especially since the Reformation, inspiration has commonly and most unreasonably meant the dictation by God to men of not only the sentiments but the words of Scripture. There are many of us to whom in early life that view of the Bible was taught, and to whom, at one time, it seemed sacrilegious to express a doubt of the literal truth of even the stories of Samson or Jonah, or the standing still of the sun and moon at Joshua's command, or the speaking of Balaam's ass. And that feeling arose from the belief we

had that the Almighty, who never makes mistakes, had chosen certain men as His amanuenses, and had bidden them write all that we found between the covers of the Bible. The view was superstitious and, in the last analysis, destructive of true reverence for the Bible. The Bible with its history, poetry, prophecy, homily, apocalypse, legend, and myth, is a varied record of God's ever progressing, ever widening revelation of truth to men. It shows God not speaking supernaturally out of heaven to men's ears, but speaking naturally, age after age, through their hearts and consciences. It shows the gradual advance of spiritual knowledge and the preparation of at least one part of the world for the Christ, and best of all, it brings us face to face with Jesus himself and his divine work.

Let us confess frankly that we find in the Bible mistaken opinions, inconsistencies, contradictory statements, and inaccuracies of various sorts. But that does not disturb our enjoyment of the Bible, either in a literary sense, as our noblest English classic, or in a spiritual, as the tenderest and most sacred record of religious thought and experience in the world. We know that some of the Psalms con-

tain false and cruel sentiments common in the times when they were written, but that fact does not prevent our valuing the truly spiritual parts of the Hebrew Psalter; that the mind and words of Jesus were not fully apprehended by his earliest disciples, yet surely such knowledge does not forbid our basking in the sunshine of the Saviour's life and teachings which they record.

The Bible was written much as other books are written: the historical narratives compiled from all available sources of information, and sometimes perpetuating as history what was clearly mythical or legendary; the poetical parts shaping themselves in the fervid imaginations of poets; the prophetic having their origin in an unusually high degree of spiritual illumination.

Its value consists, first, in its appeal to the ethical and spiritual side of man's nature, the divine in him; and, second, to what is often almost entirely overlooked, its literary greatness.

It is related that Sir Walter Scott, in his last illness, when asked what book he would like to have read to him, said: "There is no book but the Bible," and we can all understand what he

meant by such words. There is no book like the Bible to quicken the conscience and arouse faith in God. There is no book that can so satisfy man's spiritual hunger, and in life's darkest hours so bring peace. There is no book that so shames the sordid and sensual spirit of the world, and whose utterances are so pronounced against oppression and wrong. The Bible is not a storehouse of proof-texts with which to build systems of theology, but rather the witness to God's life in nature, in history, and in man. It contains the truth of God; its record is part of the great revelation that is in progress in the world by means of literature, art, government, scientific discovery, and the various movements of individual and social life.

People sometimes say: "If I must read the Bible just as I read other books, separating between true and false, in its narrative and other parts, how am I ever to be sure that I have the truth?" The answer to that is: the Bible was given to teach the old truths that save the soul—that is, that make men brave and manly, devout and tender, honest and pure; given to help us keep in mind that we are all children of

God, and that sin against Him and His divine laws means sin against our own natures; that the Bible teaches no truth as necessary to salvation but the old truths that in every age have found response in the hearts and consciences of wise and reverent men.

If we are ever in doubt about the truth of the moral or religious sentiments expressed in any part of the Bible, we may safely test them by the highest standards we know, especially the standard of Christ's perfect life and teachings. If they agree with that they are right, if not they are wrong. Lord Falkland wisely says: "To those that follow their reason in the interpretation of the Scriptures, God will either give His grace for assistance to find the truth, or His pardon if they miss it."

The literary value of the Bible has been but little regarded in places where people cared about the Book principally for the proof texts it yielded for their favorite dogmas. But the Bible is a collection of venerable and noble writings, that together make a book without a parallel in the world. It is a varied literature, containing lofty imagination, eloquence and poetry unsurpassed, wonderfully-written narra-

tive, delightful biography, interesting tradition and legend, profound spiritual utterances, and fresh, clear, crisp suggestions for practical life.

There have been few, if any, great literary men who have not been lovers of the Bible, whether they cared for the popular theology that was forced from its pages or not. Emerson, whose great mission was to show that *revelation* is not confined to a book, but is broad and deep as human history and human life, nay, universal as creation itself, says, among other noble things, of the Bible: "The most original book in the world is the Bible. This old collection of the ejaculations of love and dread, of the supreme desires and contritions of men, proceeding out of the region of the grand and eternal, seems . . . the alphabet of the nations. . . . The elevation of this book may be measured by observing how certainly all observation of thought clothes itself in its words and forms of speech. . . . Whatever is majestically thought in a great moral element, instantly approaches this old Sanscrit. . . . Shakespeare, the first literary genius of the world, the highest in whom the moral is not the predominating element, leans on the Bible; his poetry pre-

supposes it. . . . People imagine that the place which the Bible holds in literature it owes to miracles. It owes it simply to the fact that it came out of a profounder depth of thought than any other book."

To the ordinary teaching of the Bible by religious people and in the Churches, is distinctly due much of the neglect the Bible now suffers among us. It is the record of faith and so the inspirer of faith; and it is our noblest classic, to be studied before Homer or Shakespeare, or any of the great authors of ancient or modern times. It should be read rationally. It should be read daily. Its sacred words should be committed to memory in early life and treasured to old age. Its biographies should be studied, its poetry enjoyed, its righteous principles taken into the soul, and its uplifting, spiritual truths suffered to steal into our lives like the perfume of flowers, or soft strains of music at the eventide.

but the Church of the spirit. The words of faith which cannot be transposed are : ' I believe in the Holy Ghost ; in the holy Catholic Church.' "—MULFORD, " Republic of God."

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."—ST. PAUL.

"The Gospel first placed these two great principles as the main pillars of the new moral structure : God the universal Father ; mankind one brotherhood ; God made known through the mediation of His Son, the image and humanized type and exemplar of His goodness ; mankind of one kindred, and therefore of equal rank in the sight of the Creator, and to be united in one spiritual commonwealth."—Dean MILMAN, " History of Christianity," vol. I., p. 204.

"To you and me and men like ourselves is committed, in these anxious days, that which is at once an awful responsibility and a splendid destiny—to transform this modern world into a Christian society. . . . to gather together the scattered forces of a divided Christendom into a confederation, in which organization will be of less account than fellowship with one spirit and faith in one Lord—into a communion wide as human life and deep as human need—into a Church which shall outshine even the golden glory of its dawn by the splendor of its eternal noon."—EDWIN HATCH, M.A., Bampton Lectures, 1880.

"I am truly thankful to hear that I have helped to make a Churchman of you. The longer I live the more I find the Church of England the most rational, liberal, practical form which Christianity has yet assumed. . . . Strange to say, Thomas Carlyle now says that the Church of England is the most rational thing he sees now going."—"Life of Charles Kingsley," vol. II., p. 136 (extract from a private letter).

"The Church must welcome to its bosom all who are willing to be taught of Jesus, and to bear His cross ; all who have come to Him and acknowledged Him as the Master."—Bishop VAIL.

THE CHURCH.

“ Every idea must have a visible unfolding ; a habitation is necessary to any principle ; a church is God between four walls ; every dogma must have a temple.”—VICTOR HUGO.

“ In the very earliest period, the Christian society presents itself as a simple association of a common creed and common sentiments ; the first Christians united to enjoy together the same emotions and the same religious convictions. We find among them no system of determinate doctrines, no rules, no discipline, no body of magistrates.

“ At the end of the fourth and at the beginning of the fifth century, Christianity was no longer merely an individual belief ; it was an institution ; it was constituted. It was not only a religion, it was also a church.”—GUIZOT’S “ History of Civilization.”

“ The various grades of the Christian clergy have sprung up in Christian society in the same ways, and by the same divine, because the same natural, necessity as the various grades of government, law, and science.”—Dean STANLEY.

“ In its earliest usage, therefore, catholic means universal as opposed to individual, particular. The Church throughout the world is called catholic, just as the resurrection of all mankind is called catholic. In its later sense, as a fixed attribute, it implies orthodoxy as opposed to heresy, conformity as opposed to dissent. Thus, to the primary idea of *extension* are superadded also the ideas of doctrine and unity. But this later sense grows out of the earlier. The truth was the same everywhere, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod at omnibus*. The heresies were partial, scattered, localized, isolated.”—Bishop LIGHTFOOT.

“ The life of the spirit has its witness to the world in the Church.

“ The Church has an organic unity and life.

“ The Church is the company of all faithful people.

“ The Church is the witness to the life of the spirit in humanity. It is not the source of the life of the spirit, but the witness of it. The spirit is not the gift of the Church,

THE CHURCH.

Churches or societies for the promotion of religious life and thought have always existed in the world, and it is difficult to see how the growth of mankind in knowledge and culture has made them any less necessary to-day than they have ever been. Our conception of the function of religion may be different from that our fathers held. The Church may no longer regard it as her mission to try to frighten people into the kingdom of heaven with unnatural teachings concerning God and the life to come, but surely man needs as much as ever for the development of his spiritual faculties, the quickening of his conscience, the nurture of his true instincts and perceptions, the pure and gentle ministrations of the unseen spirit, who in all ages has influenced the soul through churches and sacraments and prayers, and whose perpetual mission it is to redeem the world from sordidness and sin by showing it the essen-

tial truth its life contains. The Church is the great witness to the truth within man as well as without, and all questions concerning it, historical or otherwise, must therefore be full of interest.

There are two ways of thought regarding the origin of institutions or customs with which we are familiar, and which age or long use has made sacred. One of these ways is to imagine the institution or custom as having come full-fledged into existence in some remote time, under the sanction of some high authority; the other to regard it as having been slowly evolved out of preëxistent conditions or modes. The latter way of thought is that now universally followed in scientific investigation of all sorts, and by the most trustworthy students in every department of research. Just as we trace our own present judgments in matters of thought and practical life back to their crude beginnings in our childish conceptions of things about and things above us, so the modern student has learned that if he would understand them he must trace familiar institutions and rites back to their earliest beginnings.

The introduction of this method into the sphere of religion has wrought great changes in modern theological conceptions, and throughout enlightened Protestantism has released men from slavery to irrational views concerning the visible Church and its symbols or sacraments.

There are few subjects on which so much has been written as the proper organization of the Christian Church. Romanists have written in defence of the Papacy, English and American Churchmen have written in defence of Episcopacy, Presbyterians, Independents, and Methodists have successively argued for their peculiar form of church order. And almost all, in turn, have claimed for themselves an exclusive *divine* right to exist. Among this medley of opinions, unfortunately, all claiming support from the same passages in the New Testament, and all appealing with equal confidence to apostolic usage, it is no wonder that many a man has given up trying to decide what seemed so perplexing a question, and at last has grown indifferent to all forms of organized Christianity.

Indifference to the Church as an institution

is not, however, philosophical or right, any more than indifference to the state and its constitution, for, as there are important philosophical principles involved in all existing theories of government, so there are in all theories of church order and administration.

When a number of men are inspired with common sentiments, the first thing that suggests itself is the idea of organization. Community of feeling quickly draws them together, and besides, united they will be better able to extend their principles among others. The christian Churches of the Apostolic age were formed in obedience to this law of organization, and there is no more reason to suppose that in the beginning God gave express commands concerning them, than that He gave express commands concerning the government of the empire into which Christianity was born. He is the inspirer of true religion and good order everywhere, and He loves "whatsoever is lovely and of good report." Thus we have the right to claim the most divine sanction for whatever Church organization, in the better judgment of mankind, seems to embody most faithfully the true principles of religion and order. Hooker,

in his "Ecclesiastical Polity," says: "Church government is a thing which the Church *itself* constitutes under a Divine authorization to do so." "We must note that he that affirmeth speech to be necessary among all men throughout the world doth not thereby import that all men must necessarily speak one kind of language. Even so the necessity of polity and regimen in all churches may be held, without holding any one certain form to be necessary for them all."

The theory of the church, however, that in the third century, under the influence of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, shaped itself for Western Christendom, regarded the episcopal order alone as having a right to exist, and sought to limit the working of God's grace to that, appealing to Scripture no less than tradition for its authority. The Presbyterian and Independent Churches of the sixteenth century, disputing the exclusive claims of the mediæval catholic church, in the same spirit, likewise appealed to Scripture, and so there have come down to our time, besides the Roman Catholic, two distinct and indeed mutually exclusive theories of the church, each building itself on Scripture,

and seeking to prove itself the true Apostolic Church. These two views are thus described by Bishop Kip in his "Double Witness of the Church": "We contend, then, that in accordance with the directions given by our Lord, His Apostles, acting under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, established a Church having a ministry of three orders, and which has been continued by their successors down to the present time. These three orders were: 1st, the Apostles, called in the following age the Bishops; 2d, the Presbyters or Elders; and 3d, the Deacons.

"We contend, also, that there is no instance of ordination recorded in Scripture, as being performed by any except the Apostles, or others, as Timothy, or Titus, who had been invested by them with the authority of Bishops; in other words, that there is no instance anywhere of mere Presbyters ordaining. And we believe that this remained an established rule of the Church, never violated for more than 1500 years, until at the Reformation in the sixteenth century, when some bodies of Christians, who had separated from the Church, proceeded to ordain ministers by the hands of mere priests

or Presbyters. We therefore require in those who officiate at our altars that they should be Episcopally ordained—that is, that they should be ordained by some Bishop, who has derived his authority from those Bishops who went before him in the Church in uninterrupted succession since the Apostles' days. This is the doctrine of the Apostolical succession. On the other hand, those who deny the necessity of Episcopal government, assert that the Apostles of the Early Church left no successors—that is, that it is not necessary for ordination to be performed by a Bishop—that there is but one order of ministers in the Church, that of Presbyters—and that these have a right, by their own authority, to ordain and admit to the ministry. Such, then, is the dividing line between us, and to decide which view is right and most in accordance with the government of the Primitive Church, we must refer to intimations given in Scripture, and the testimony of History in the earliest ages of our faith.”

From this point Bishop Kip, to support his view of the sole divine authority of an episcopal organization of the church, goes on to build, by analogy, an argument from the Jewish Church

and its complicated organization, from certain incidental passages in the New Testament, and from early Christian history.

His argument is elaborated with great care, but one feels, as he follows it, that it is hardly more binding on reason than the equally ingenious argument for the sole authority of the papal organization, since it takes almost as much for granted. The chief assumption which underlies all claims, whether of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, or Independents, for the sole divine right of a particular form of church order, is that Jesus intended to establish such an order to the exclusion of any other. But it seems strange that any one can read the simple story of his life and teachings, and not feel how significant is his silence with regard to the externals of religion; can find any thing like hierarchical pretensions or aims in those earnest missionary teachers—his first disciples. When Jesus was asked about the external signs of his kingdom, he invariably tried to show men that his kingdom meant the advance of spirituality and faith. When his earliest disciples formed new Christian congregations, they seemed desirous of giving them the simplest and fewest laws

necessary for their corporate existence ; when St. Paul spoke sorrowfully about schism, he did it not as the advocate of a theory of the church such as Cyprian and Augustine long afterward held—a theory which limited God's kingdom to a certain external order, and made it a fearful sin to violate that,—but rather as a Christian minister, who saw a community wickedly quarrelling over the most peaceable and sacred truths of religion, and instead of living as brethren in one household of faith, setting up rival households, and so practically denying the most vital principles of the Gospel.

We have no evidence that Jesus or the Apostles held or sought to promulgate any exclusive theory of church order or legislation. All over Judea congregations of Jews existed, each with its separate corps of elders, part of whom were appointed to conduct its worship, part to manage its affairs, and whenever one of these synagogue congregations became convinced that Jesus was the Messiah it seems to have taken on a Christian form, without, in any essential particular, changing its constitution. The Apostles or persons appointed by them naturally assumed the general oversight

of these new congregations and their elder-ships, especially where they were formed in non-Jewish communities, and thus, so far as can be ascertained, for in the New Testament there is a marked absence of direct statement concerning it, the polity of the early church grew up,—a polity that would seem to have been for the most part accidental rather than deliberately planned, and to have combined some of the features of both Presbyterianism and Independency, but to have contained, at least in germ, the moderate Episcopacy of a later time. We have little accurate knowledge of the growth of the episcopal order during the first three centuries. Certain passages from a letter called the *Epistle to the Corinthians*, written by Clement of Rome, a fellow-laborer of St. Paul, in the second century, and from the letters of Ignatius, who was martyred about the year 115, and from the writings of Irenæus, who died at the beginning of the third century, are confidently appealed to by those who desire to trace the episcopal order of the church to Jesus and the Apostles. On the other hand, those who believe in episcopacy as a growth or development, think that the supremacy of the

bishop, which is clearly enough to be seen in the Latin Church in the third century, the time of Tertullian and Cyprian, had its origin in simple respect for seniority, and the preëminence naturally accorded chief presbyters or elders in the more important churches. On this disputed point, Dean Milman, in his "*History of Christianity*" (vol. I., p. 19), has spoken wisely and fairly, and as he has left the question, so we think all fair-minded people should leave it. "The whole of Christendom," he says, "when it emerges out of the obscurity of the first century, appears uniformly governed by certain superiors of each community called 'bishops,' but the origin and extent of this superiority, and the manner in which the Bishop assumed a distinct authority from the inferior presbyters, is one of those difficult questions of Christian history, which, since the Reformation, has been more and more darkened by those fatal enemies to candid and dispassionate enquiry, prejudice and interest."

And again (vol. II., p. 30): "The manner and the period of the separation of a distinct class, a hierarchy, from the general body of the community, and the progress of the great division

between the clergy and the laity, are equally obscure with the primitive constitution of the church. Like the Judaism of the provinces, Christianity (at first) had no sacerdotal order."

Tradition assigns the establishment of episcopacy, at least in Asia Minor, to St. John, and the Latin father Jerome, as quoted by Hooker ("Ecclesiastical Polity," vol. III., book 7, p. 130), says: "Till through instinct of the devil, there grew in the Church factions, and among the people it began to be professed, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, churches were governed by the common voice of presbyters; but when every one began to reckon those whom he had baptized, his own, and not Christ's, it was decreed in the whole world that one chosen out of the presbyters should be placed above the rest, to whom all the care of the Church should belong, and so all seeds of schism be removed." It is not improbable that in some quarters episcopacy may thus have originated, and that St. John, as tradition says, may have had much to do with the appointment of successors to the Apostles.

But it is clearly impossible to establish the extreme view of Cyprian or Augustine, that

there is "no Church without a bishop"; and, at least, the difficulties of New Testament interpretation, and the uncertainties of early church history, are far too great to warrant us in telling an inquirer that if he will read for himself he will find the proofs.

What reasons, then, have Episcopalians for their adherence to the Episcopal Church, and on what grounds can they ask people bred under other systems to give it their allegiance? No Episcopalian can properly tell people that his is the only Church, for we have no sufficient grounds for the belief that either Jesus or his Apostles contemplated a particular form of church organization, never to be abrogated nor changed. Much of the best Christian life for centuries has not been included in the Churches that hold to the Catholic order—that is, that acknowledge bishops; and the church's only apology for being is the mission she has to make men realize their sonship of God.

The Episcopal or *Anglican* Church is one of the great Churches of Christendom, her history tracing back to the earliest period of the establishment of Christianity in Britain, her consti-

tution essentially the same as that of the Greek and Roman Churches. But Christianity would have a very hopeless outlook if we were obliged to limit it to either the Greek, the Roman, or the English Church, or to all of them combined, for in both East and West a large part of the Christian population belongs to other churches than these, many of which have no idea of adopting the episcopal order.

In the United States a large proportion of the clergy of the Episcopal Church have been bred wholly, or in part, in other communions, and to her laity there are accessions continually, from the surrounding churches. It was recently stated that, in the last twenty years, the number of communicants in the Episcopal Church in the United States had grown from 161,224 to 398,098, and the number of dioceses and jurisdictions from 34 to 65, and much of this growth, at least in the number of communicants, has been in the older States, and in places where Calvinism once prevailed. But it is clearly not true that changes from Calvinism, or Unitarianism, are commonly the result of a conviction that the Episcopal Church is the only true church. There are other sufficient reasons for

such changes without supposing the adoption of so groundless a theory as this. The Episcopal Church has advantages which some others do not possess; she has a history that goes back continuously to the establishment of religion in Britain in the second century. She has a liturgy that, in the so-called Protestant world, for dignity and spirituality, has no parallel. She is catholic, not only, according to the earliest usage of that word, in that she recognizes herself as part of the great Christian family, and feels in herself the thrills of all true life, but also in the later meaning of the word, whereby it stood for that part of the Christian world which recognized the episcopal order, and to whose keeping, through the Middle Ages, were entrusted the rich treasures of tradition that have come down to us. She has a doctrine of apostolic succession which keeps her from degenerating into mere voluntarism. But this doctrine of apostolic succession does not mean that, in some magical way, special grace is conveyed by the touch of a bishop's hands, but rather that the Church recognizes herself as a continuous body, whose threefold order has never been broken as far back as church history

can be traced.¹ An Independent Church can make itself at any time, without reference to what has gone before. The Episcopal Church has a permanent external order and authority, which she transmits from age to age. Thus she is able to bring into modern civilization, with its unsettled conditions, its comparative newness and crudeness, an element of stability and permanence that such a civilization greatly needs. A pastor of one of the leading Unitarian Churches of the Eastern States said lately, on

¹ We are perfectly familiar with the disputes regarding the age of the Episcopal Church—whether she may properly claim to be the English Church of the Middle Ages reformed, or whether her origin is to be sought in *Reformation* times. Can any church perpetuating the main principle of organization, the chief traditions belonging to historic Christianity, never having broken with these, be ranked, in point of age, with the churches that newly arose during the Reformation?

It may be further alleged that a few hundred years, more or less, does not increase the value of such an organization. But there are few in cultured communities who are insensible to the claims of antiquity, or the notes of catholicity.

That the Episcopal Church, as she now is, is not free from serious limitations, is, however, apparent to all who desire for Christianity the largest and most rational expression; and there are many within her fold who, while strongly attached to her, yet look to see her and other churches merged into a great *American Catholic Church*. It would, however, seem that this *Church of the future* must in some form perpetuate the main features of historic Christianity.

his return from a trip through some of the newer parts of the West, that he had never felt so strongly the value of the Episcopal Church as when he had found it, with its orderly and beautiful service, in rude and rough places on the frontier. It was, he said, the only bit of refined civilization they had. This is not true of other parts of the country, yet there can be little doubt that it is from a conviction that she, of all churches, is best equipped for the work of advancing a higher type of Christian civilization, that so many men turn from other churches to her doors.

A few years ago, when the Calvinistic churches were more hide-bound than now, people used to look with wonder on the differences of opinion that existed within the Episcopal Church, and some gave her, a little in derision, the epithet of the "Roomy Church." But, of late, the sneer has died away, and there are few who do not now feel that her breadth is one thing that shows her fitness to be the spiritual home of the human brotherhood. She is not a school of philosophy, but the nursery of the instincts of worship, and of pure and earnest life.

Her terms of admission are not found in articles of faith, but rather in the recognition of the native obligations of the soul to truth and virtue. She gathers the tempted to her altars and gives them strength, the doubting and gives them faith, the sorrowing and gives them consolation, and none are too weak, too doubting, or too sad to find a welcome in her fold. So in the future as in the past it would seem that her progress must keep pace with the growth of thought and culture.

To sum up what we have said: churches were first established in obedience to the instinct that bids men of like sentiments unite. They were established for the promotion of the moral and spiritual—that is, the whole welfare of mankind. They were meant to help men realize the divine sonhood, the universal brotherhood, and amid the fleeting conditions of this human life to give the soul a firmer grasp on that which never changes. The laws of their polity were the divine principles that are given for the establishment of good government everywhere, the principles of catholicity and permanence. These conditions the Episcopal Church, in her constitution, fully realizes,

and it is the continual aim of all large-minded men within her fold to keep her true to her divine mission—to teach men morality and faith, and to unite them in a large and rational way for the promotion of the truths that save society and lift mankind nearer to God.

In opposition to the sectarian principle that men have a right to make churches on the basis of individual opinions, she declares that no church can properly be made except on the basis of fundamental moral and spiritual truth, and that in such a church many individual opinions must necessarily exist.

In the modern Christian world she stands for unity and permanence.

Into her thought of unity come past, present, and future. Her fellowship is with true souls of all times :

“The saints above and those below
But one communion make.”

Her permanence is the witness to the unchanging life of God, and the eternal supremacy in the universe of His kingdom of law and love.

THE SACRAMENTS.

“Earth’s crammed with heaven,
And every common bush afire with God ;
But only he who sees takes off his shoes.”

—MRS. BROWNING.

“The sacraments become the evidence of the common life of humanity. They take up the types of nature in its own life. This water is the symbol of purity ; this bread and wine are the symbols of the strength and joy of man. They are the common elements of life. They are the witness of the presence of Him in the life of humanity, in whom the worship of the visible is overcome and destroyed. This baptism is given to children of every tribe and race ; as the sign of their common relation with Him, who hath broken down the wall of partition, to make in Himself of twain one new man.”—MULFORD, “Republic of God.”

“Observe, then, baptism does not *create* a child of God. It authoritatively declares him. It does not make the fact ; it only reveals it. If baptism made it a fact, then and there for the first time baptism would be magic. Nay, faith does not create a child of God any more than baptism, nor does it make a fact. It only appropriates that which is a fact already.

“The Catechism, however, says : ‘In baptism I was *made* a child of God.’ Yes ; coronation makes a sovereign ; but, paradoxical as it may seem, it can only *make* a sovereign one who is a sovereign already. Crown a pretender, that coronation will not create the king.

“This doctrine protests against the notion of our being separate units in the Divine life. The church of Calvinism is merely a collection of atoms,—a sand-heap piled together, with no cohesion among themselves ; or a mass of steel filings cleaving separately to a magnet, but not to each other. Baptism proclaims a church—humanity joined in Christ to God.

“The things of earth are pledges of things in heaven. It is not for nothing that God has selected for His sacrament the commonest of all acts—a meal,—and the most abundant of all materials—water. Think you that He means to say that only through two channels His Spirit streams into the soul? Or is it not much more in unison with His dealings to say that these two are set apart to signify to us the sacramental character of all nature?”—Rev. F. W. ROBERTSON.

“In the early Church, the careful distinction which later times have made between Baptism, Regeneration, Conversion, and Repentance did not exist. They all meant the same thing.

“As in other parts of the Bible the hand, the heart, the face of God are used for God Himself, so the body, the flesh of Christ, are used for Christ Himself, for His whole personality and character.”—Dean STANLEY, “Christian Institutions.”

“The real presence of Christ’s body and blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament.”—HOOKER.

THE SACRAMENTS.

Religion has always formed for its outward expression rites or symbols to serve as rallying points for faith and worship. Some simple object or act of common life has generally been pressed into this sacred use, and thus has been so charged with special significance, so freighted with new meaning, that in time its true origin, as a religious rite, has come to be forgotten.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the two symbolical and representative sacramental rites of the Christian Religion.

They are the two simple acts of washing and eating exalted above life's other common acts for the purposes of organized Christianity; and their history has been much the same as that of other representative religious rites not only of Christianity but of the older Religions. Beginning simply and naturally, in time they have come to be regarded with superstitious

reverence, and to be adored, not for the truth they were set apart to represent, but for themselves. We are all perfectly familiar with the two opposite ways of regarding them that prevail among us. The Roman Catholic Church holds them as sacred mysteries to be revered beyond all other religious acts, because of some supposed vital relation in which they stand to the soul of man, while the extreme wing of so-called rational or non-churchly Christianity regards them as archaic and outworn rites, no more claiming the allegiance of people to-day than the grand and impressive ceremonial of the Egyptian Religion or the sacrificial rites of old-time Judaism. The truth about them, as usual, lies between these two extremes. There is nothing in the accounts of their early institution or in the nature of the case, to warrant us in giving them the reverence of the Roman Catholic, and there is much to make us value them far beyond those who treat them as the mere playthings of superstition. Any rite or symbol that has been loved and venerated by large numbers of earnest people, and that has ministered to spirituality and peace, however opinions may differ as to its

permanent usefulness, demands respectful treatment from all.

There are two questions to be considered in this chapter on the Christian Sacraments, their history, and their perpetual significance and value.

BAPTISM.

Baptism is the first of them, and it takes us far away from our present surroundings to the remote East, among peoples whose modes of thought and expression differ widely from our own, and whose habits of life, owing to climatic conditions wholly dissimilar to ours, are often such as we can hardly understand.

In Oriental countries, owing to the dust and heat, both cleanliness and comfort demand very frequent bathing of the whole body; and the out-door life and comparatively small amount of clothing worn make the bath a simpler matter than with us. We cannot therefore be surprised when in all the great Religions of the East we find the act of washing the body, either completely or in part, used to symbolize internal purification, or transformation of character.

There has been much fruitless discussion, among people who felt it necessary to perpetuate the exact form of administration of Baptism known to the early converts of Christianity, concerning the use and prevalence of this rite among the Hebrews before Christ's time, but it is much more to the purpose to discover that the rite was connected with the religion not only of the Hebrews but of all other Eastern peoples; that the Egyptians, Persians, and Hindoos, as well as the Hebrews, baptized those whom they wished to initiate into the full privileges of faith, or for whom they desired greater holiness of life.

Thus, when John, the herald of the Messiah arose in the wilderness of Judea, no priest, but an intensely devout and earnest layman who, in common with many of the Jewish sect of the Essenes and with some of the older prophets, had retired to the wilderness to gain spiritual power by contemplation, prayer, and fasting, he naturally coupled with his preaching the simple, healthful act of bathing the body.

The Essenes were even more scrupulous bathers than the Pharisees, for the sake of

their ablutions always choosing their solitary abodes on the banks of rivers or in the vicinity of clear mountain springs. Indeed, ceremonial bathing took up a great part of their time, and so there is no reason why the baptism of John should have awakened more surprise among the people of Palestine than it did. The bath in water was so much a part of the outward religious life of the Hebrews that no one could think it strange or other than appropriate that when he found their hearts stirred by his preaching the prophet not only spoke earnestly to them about their lives, but gave them a bath in the river Jordan, whose soft, refreshing waters flowed near by, so sending them back into the world freshly consecrated to God and His service.

From this natural beginning grew the Christian rite of Baptism, for although John's active mission was soon ended, the early Christian teachers, some of whom, as indeed Jesus himself, had received baptism in the Jordan, continued the practice of baptizing those who came under the deeper influences of the religious life.

At first the rite seems to have been limited

to those who in adult life embraced the spiritual truths Jesus taught, but little by little, as in the older religions, it came to be performed on infants and little children, the ceremony in these cases differing somewhat from that used in the baptism of adults. It is impossible to trace the steps by which this change came about. The sources of church history in the first and second centuries are exceedingly meagre, and we have no means of knowing whether infants were baptized in Apostolic times or not. It is certain, however, that the practice of Infant Baptism was not universal, in some quarters perhaps not common, even so late as the middle of the fourth century, for the Fathers, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem of Edessa, Ambrose, Basil, and Augustine, all born of Christian parents and all save one during the first half of this century, were not baptized until they reached adult life. Nor can we be certain which influence was stronger in bringing about its general acceptance—the natural and proper feeling that the Christian Church was a school for the education of young and old in faith and worship, or that dark superstition fostered by Augustine,

that even infants dying without the bath of Baptism were consigned to everlasting fire.

It is, however, largely to the influence of this Father that we must trace the materialistic belief concerning Baptism as necessary to save the soul from future torment, which in all its hideous untruth, like a dark shadow, haunted the Western Church during the Middle Ages. The Church of Rome, in a form so mild, however, that Augustine would have censured it as unorthodox, still holds to the doctrine, and thus virtually declares that the infinite grace of God, the infinite possibilities of the human soul, are made dependent by our Heavenly Father on the sprinkling of a few drops of water during life on the head of a man or child. Our own baptismal service, which was framed before the Church had fully emancipated itself from the unspiritual philosophy of the Middle Ages, is not wholly free from traces of the Augustinian belief, and many persons, especially of the *Evangelical* wing of the Episcopal Church, have been sorely tried by certain clauses in it.¹ It

¹ It would be strange, if in a Church so comprehensive as ours, no traces still remained of this mediæval belief regarding the power of baptism to produce an entire change in the

has been repeatedly declared, however, both in England and America, that the Church imposes no irrational or superstitious view of Baptism on her clergy or laity; that her baptismal service is not to be interpreted against the rational convictions of this or any age.

As the early simplicity of the doctrine of Baptism disappeared, there grew up about the rite many curious and interesting customs, such as exorcism, or setting free from the power of the devil, a rite which had hitherto been used only in cases where people were supposed to be

nature, and to deliver the individual from the wrath of God. Accordingly we find in use in Episcopal Churches manuals of instruction containing questions and answers like the following :

Q. What are we made by Holy Baptism ?

A. Members of Christ's Body, the Church.

Q. What is the result of this ?

A. We become God's adopted children, and heirs of Heaven.

Q. And what else ?

A. We are cleansed from sin, and our bodies are made temples of the Holy Ghost.

Q. Of what, then is the Grace of Baptism the seed ?

A. It is the *seed of the spiritual life in the soul of man.*

Q. How do we become members of the Church ?

A. By being baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Q. Is there any sure way to salvation out of the Church ?

A. There is not.

—*Trinity Church Catechism.*

possessed with demons. Anointing with the sacred oil, or chrism, was also one of the connected rites ; and the laying on of hands, which later came to be separated by an interval of time from Baptism, and grew into the rite of confirmation, which we must always regard as the proper *completion*, with the candidate's own free consent, of the baptismal rite which he received in infancy.

But perhaps the most striking thing in the history of the outward part of the rite is the change which, in the West, gradually came about, from the complete immersion of the body in water to the sprinkling of a few drops on the candidate's head. "For the first thirteen centuries," says Dean Stanley, "the almost universal practice of Baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word 'baptize,'—that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed into the water"; and in this judgment fully coincide such eminent scholars in the English Church as Conybeare and Howson,¹ and Bishop Ellicott and Professor

¹ See "Life and Epistle of St. Paul," vol. i, p. 439 ; Conybeare and Howson.

Plumptre,¹ and Church historians like Kurtz and Mosheim.

In the Greek Church trine immersion is the rule, and unless it be, as in the early ages, in the case of persons too sick or feeble to undergo immersion, sprinkling, or even pouring, is not recognized as baptism. In the Western Church, however, gradually, as most religious ideas and customs have grown up, immersion changed to sprinkling, the Cathedral of Milan and the large and influential Baptist body now alone observing the rite in its primitive form. The reason for this almost universal change in Western Christendom is sufficiently clear, and shows how infallibly time discerns the essential spirit and meaning of any form of truth committed to it. Baptism was simply the common act of washing taken to symbolize the purification of the soul, the continuous process of new birth that goes on in every truly advancing life; and while in the warm East it would be more natural to perform it by dipping the whole body in water, in colder climates, and especially in churches established in cities

¹ Commentary on Matt. iii., 1, Mark vii., 4, Luke xi., 38, Acts viii., 38; Bishop Ellicott and Professor Plumptre.

and towns, or where intelligence and culture prevailed, release from the mere letter of obedience to Scripture, or of conformity to early custom, would necessarily be attended not only with indifference to the amount of water used, but with a certain repugnance to the public bath. There is no question that were the conditions favorable, a plunge in a lake or river, under the blue sky of heaven, in some calm, secluded place, would be far more impressive than the sprinkling of the forehead with water from a stone font or a bowl in a church.

But, with us, immersion is so manifestly inexpedient, so opposed to modern ideas, and the spirit that requires it is so unlike the spirit of liberty in ritual things inculcated by the teaching of Christ, that one cannot help wondering that a large body of religious people should still be found clinging to it, and indeed making the observance of it their *raison d'être*.

There is no ground on which the change from immersion to sprinkling can be justified except the ground of enlightened common-sense, but there it is safe to rest—unsafe not to rest—all our beliefs and opinions. There, likewise, is our justification for baptizing infants. Baptism

is intended to symbolize and so keep before the world the great truth of regeneration, the new birth, or resurrection from the death of ignorance, selfishness, lust, and sin, which is a continual process in true lives. And being the natural door to the Church, which we regard as a *school* for the nurture of Christian life, and not an exclusive body of perfectly righteous men and women, it is inevitable that we should bestow it upon children. We baptize them in token of the fact that they are God's children; and as members of a regenerated and regenerating society, of which the Church is the perpetual type and witness, early incorporate their innocent lives into the Church's life. Infant Baptism, and our view of the Church as a mixed school for the nurture of faith and worship and holy life, are so closely bound together that we can hardly think of them apart. Under Calvinism, which does not recognize God in the soul of every being, and under the Independent theory of the Church as a company of mature persons voluntarily associating themselves for religious purposes, Infant Baptism has no true place and must inevitably fall into disuse. The Baptists, Charles

Kingsley once said, are the true and logical Calvinists, for they do not believe that people are God's children until they have passed through certain changes of feeling which may or may not come, and so they refuse to baptize them as if they were such. To us who believe that humanity is "God-related," that the human is grounded in the divine, the finite in the infinite, Infant Baptism is not only richly significant, but, if Baptism is to be maintained at all, almost a necessity.

Thus we may bring our children to Baptism, "nothing doubting but that God alloweth this charitable work of ours," and giving Him thanks that it "hath pleased Him to regenerate them with His Holy Spirit"—that is, to give them naturally the privileges of children of the Most High, and in order to make them sharers in the regenerating influences of Christian society, to "incorporate them into His holy Church."

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Lord's Supper originated as naturally and simply as Baptism, but under circumstances far more touching. The Master, about

to suffer a painful and humiliating death, sat with his twelve disciples at night in an upper room somewhere in Jerusalem. It was Pass-over time, and they, like all faithful Hebrews, had come up to the city to celebrate together this most significant of all their festivals, and now the meal was almost done. We can never know all that was passing in Jesus' mind,—how much regard he felt for the venerable Passover ritual he was so scrupulously observing, nor how clearly he foresaw the establishment of a religion, looking to him as its founder, which should supersede the Hebrew Faith. We can never be certain how widely he hoped or expected his parting request should be observed, but we are told that as he reclined with them he took up some of the bread that lay on the table, and instead of using the regular words, "This is the body of the Passover," or "This is the bread of affliction," he said, in view of his approaching martyrdom for the principles of true religion which he had persistently taught, "This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me." Then he took up the cup of red wine and water, the drinking of which was one of the last acts

of the Festival, and instead of the words commonly uttered, said: *This cup is the seal of the covenant presently to be made in my blood which is to be shed for you.* Then after chanting together the anthem beginning, "Not unto us, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory for Thy mercy and for Thy truth's sake," the group arose and passed silently out in the light of the great yellow moon into the narrow street, through a gate of the city, down into the valley, of the Kedron, and so on to the Garden of Gethsemane. This is the simple beginning of that most venerated and cherished rite of the Church, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, about which cluster not only some of the sacrest and sweetest, but some of the saddest and most corrupt traditions of the Christian world; now a bond of the holiest brotherhood, now a mark of unchristian strife and superstition.

At first it was celebrated at evening, the time when Christ had instituted it, and always at the close of a common meal called the *ἀγάπη*, or love feast, and with prayer and praise, whence from *εὐχαρίστια*, the Greek word for thanksgiving, it came to be called the

eucharist. As early as the third century the simple devotional forms with which it was at first observed expanded into an "elaborate sacramental liturgy," which is the basis of our own and of all the Catholic eucharistic liturgies. Then it came to be regarded as a holy mystery, participation in which was necessary to insure everlasting life; and when, as has happened in all great Religions, the ideas of a priesthood and material sacrifice were developed in the Church, the Lord's Supper in the hands of the officiating priest became a veritable sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, into which, by a miracle, as the prayer of consecration was offered, the bread and wine were changed. This belief, which to-day finds its support in the Roman Catholic Church, and which declares that Christ's death is repeated every time a priest standing before the altar consecrates the bread and wine, was of course a late development, and in the theology of the enlightened Christian teachers of Alexandria had no place. With them, as with us, the bread and wine on the altar were simply, as our Prayer Book calls them, God's "gifts and creatures of bread and wine," which they re-

ceived, according to the Saviour's "holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion." The sacrifice they offered to God was "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," and of their own "souls and bodies," and the body and blood of Christ of which they partook was "spiritual," not material food. The body of Christ was moral truth as displayed in his character, and the blood of Christ was love or charity.

The superstitious view of the Lord's Supper held by the Latin Church in the Middle Ages has, however, its own antiquity. The ancient religions of Persia, Egypt, India, and Greece all had rites very similar to our Lord's Supper, and there were many persons under all these Faiths who supposed that in partaking of consecrated bread and wine they were actually eating the flesh and drinking the blood of their gods. "How can a man be so stupid," says Cicero, writing of the heathen eucharist, "as to imagine that which he eats to be a god?" But antiquity in religious opinions should have little weight when it conflicts with intelligence and common-sense. We sometimes hear heated discussions concerning the propriety of using

lighted candles and special vestments and of bowing often in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. But the only thing that can make these wrong, provided a congregation is pleased to have them, is the fact of their testifying to a material and unenlightened, and, indeed, ancient heathen view of the Sacrament. If the introduction of these accessories, harmless in themselves, into Christian worship expresses simply the desire for a more earnest and beautiful ceremonial, then no one can say aught against them, provided they do not violate well-established canons of good taste, but if they are meant to symbolize and teach a materialistic and magical view of the sweet and simple Christian memorial feast, then they are harmful and wrong.

Throughout this chapter we have spoken of Baptism and the Lord's Supper in the customary way of the Church and the Prayer Book as *Sacraments*, and in the beginning of the chapter we called them *representative* Sacraments. The word sacrament originally meant an oath or pledge, as that taken by Roman soldiers on entering the army. The Christian Sacrament, then, was the pledge of the Christian's obliga-

tion to be true to the laws of God, and since obedience necessarily brings good to man, it was likewise regarded as a pledge on God's part, as indeed Jesus had declared the Lord's Supper to be when he said, "This is the new covenant," or this is the pledge of the new covenant, "in my blood."¹

Baptism and the Lord's Supper are outward signs or certificates of the relationship between God and man. When we baptize a grown man or a new-born baby we thereby certify the old truth the world needs to be continually reminded of, that we are all children of the Heavenly Father, and so under the most sacred obligations to be true to duty and to Him. We repeat by our act the old truth so easily and so often sadly forgotten, that only through obedience to God's laws, which are likewise the laws of the soul, can the human race find salvation. This our Baptismal Service makes clear when it says to the Sponsors that "Baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which is, to follow the example of our Saviour

¹ The Catechism brings out the original meaning of the word in its definition of Sacrament as not only "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us," but as "*a pledge to assure us thereof.*"

Christ, and to be made like unto him." When we come to the Lord's table, we likewise declare, as the priest who administers the Sacrament declares, both the good-will of our Heavenly Father toward us, and the obligation we are under to love and serve Him and our brethren. But the question comes, Is not every good act, especially every religious act in which we engage, likewise a sacrament or pledge on God's part and ours? To that question we have to answer "Yes." Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the bath and the meal, have been set apart from life's many sacramental acts simply as *representative* sacraments or pledges of the close alliance between God and man and the necessity of obedience to all that God has anywhere declared as His will concerning us. Observing one day in seven as, in a peculiar sense the *Lord's Day*, we thereby declare that all days are to be regarded as holy days. Assembling as churches or congregations for Christian worship and other religious acts, we thereby testify to the divine life and destiny of mankind and the holy brotherhood of the race. And in Baptism and the Eucharist we likewise set forth the sacredness of all

life's common acts and experiences. In the spirit of George Herbert's often quoted lines, we declare that even the commonest and most unhonored tasks are in truth divine.

How full of instruction and value, then, are these ancient rites of the Church to us. How sacred should we hold them as we remember not only their divine origin, but the faith and zeal, the love and reverence and holy life to which in all the Christian ages they have witnessed and ministered. Every Baptism we see not only recalls the great truths of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but seems to connect the present with the past of Christianity, and to proclaim the perpetual youth of those holy sentiments that inspired the multitudes who came to John in the wilderness of Judea ; that stirred the self-sacrificing first disciples of our Lord ; that made the early Christians in the reigns of Nero and Trajan martyrs for Christ ; that have inflamed the zeal of all noble missionaries and true ministers of religion ; and that have softened and sweetened and made saintly the lives of hosts of unknown men and women in all lands and times. As we kneel at the Lord's Table, and

with bowed heads eat the bread which symbolizes the blessed character of Jesus, and drink the wine which represents his love, we are carried back to Calvary ; and then, as we remember that the sacrifice there finished meant the perpetual sacrifice, the divine submission of all true souls in all ages, how broad and deep and tender grows the Christianity we profess ; and how many sacred memories are there awakened, memories of our blessed Lord, and of all the prophets and saints of true Religion among all nations ; memories of the early Christians forced to hide in the catacombs, and there among the silent dead to celebrate their eucharistic joy ; memories of our own dear friends who once knelt with us at the feast, but who have now passed on into the unseen, where face to face with truth, they need no longer earth's poor symbols.

These are some of the lessons enfolded in those holy rites of Religion, the Christian Sacraments. They are lessons the world can never afford to miss, lessons in which no soul can be too well instructed, since in them are involved all our true well-being here and hereafter.

THE LITURGY.

“How cold and dead does a prayer appear that is composed in the most elegant forms of speech, when it is not heightened by solemnity of phrase from the sacred writings!”—ADDISON.

“Different tastes find gratification in various forms—some in what is fixed, others in what is free and flowing.

“The time will come when all outward Churches, with their varying laws, will cease and vanish away, but when the true and essential Church of Christ will reign forever. Then will all members of His body give hearty thanks for whatsoever means has, through the gracious providence of God, been given whereby they have been brought to the knowledge and love of their Lord.

“But there is no fear of the most excellent minister who ever preached, making me desert the Church of England. Every time I go, I feel more strongly how beautiful our service is.

“It is one of the advantages of our good Church that we are only very partially dependent on the qualifications of the minister. If he can read, and most clergymen can do that much, he must read the liturgy; all his stupidity, if he be stupid, all his carelessness, if he be careless, cannot unmake that into any thing unscriptural or undevotional.”—“Memorials of a Quiet Life.”

“ The Protestant cast aside the heresies of Rome, and with them her arts, by which last rejection he injured his own character, cramped his intellect in refusing to it one of its noblest exercises, and materially diminished his influence.

“ One thing I note in comparing old prayers with modern ones, that however quaint, or however erring, they are always tenfold more condensed, comprehensive, and to their purpose, whatever that may be. There is no dilution in them, no vain or monotonous phraseology. They ask for what is desired, plainly and earnestly, and never could be shortened by a syllable.”—RUSKIN (“ Stones of Venice ”).

“ I enjoyed the fine selection of collects read from the Liturgy. What an age of earnest faith, grasping a noble conception of life and determined to bring all things into harmony with it, has recorded itself in the simple, pregnant, rhythmical English of those collects and the Bible.”—GEORGE ELIOT (extract from a letter).

“ An admirable book, in which the full spirit of the Reformation breathes out, where, beside the moving tenderness of the Gospel, and the manly accents of the Bible, throb the profound emotion, the grave eloquence, the noble-mindedness, the restrained enthusiasm of the heroic and poetic souls who had rediscovered Christianity, and had passed near the fire of martyrdom.”—TAINE, “ History of English Literature.”

THE LITURGY.

If we could have gone with Jesus and his disciples into any of the synagogues of Palestine at the time of Morning or Evening Prayer, we should have found the people worshipping with a liturgy. With phylacteries bound on their foreheads and left arms, and the fringed and tasselled Talith falling over their shoulders, we should have seen them on their entrance bowing in silent prayer, heard them responding with an Amen to the Reader's "prayer of adoration," listened with them to various Scripture readings, joined in another short prayer, heard the reading of the Song of Moses at the Red Sea, and taken part in a short responsive utterance of praise known as the Kadish, beginning "Praise the Lord who is worthy to be praised!" the response to which by the people bowing was, "Praised be the Lord who is ever and eternally worthy of praise!"

After that we should have heard more prayer

and a sublime chant : “ Rock of Israel ! up ! to the help of Israel ! save, for Thy promise sake, Judah and Israel ! Save us, eternal God, eternal God of Hosts, whose name is the Holy One of Israel ! Blessed be Thou, O Eternal, who of old didst redeem Israel ! ” And then we should have said softly with the entire congregation the “ eighteen Benedictions,” or “ The Prayer,” joined in some solemn responses, and on Mondays, Thursdays, and Sabbaths listened to the reading of the regular lessons from the Pentateuch or *the Law*. The sermon would have followed, perhaps preached by some one invited from the congregation, after which, as with us, with prayers and the benediction, the service would have closed.

Wheatley, in his treatise on the Book of Common Prayer, like many other writers on liturgical worship, has felt it necessary to argue for the validity of such worship from the loyalty of Jesus and the Apostles to the synagogue services ; but we are fortunately not obliged to content ourselves with single or exceptional testimonies to the propriety of set forms of prayer, since every great Religion has developed its own peculiar ritual, and has expressed its

reverence in traditional symbols and modes of worship.

So universal, indeed, is the liturgical spirit, that the modern Christian sects which have discarded ritual, may well be regarded as, in this respect at least, out of sympathy with the Religion of the ages. It is not true, of course, that any religious body is entirely without a ritual, but we speak now of the difference between an historic and compulsory ritual, and one virtually made by each church for itself, and subject to the desires or tastes of a particular minister or congregation. The early Christians, as Christianity gradually separated from the older Hebrew Faith, soon made their own forms of worship, which at first were comparatively brief and simple, the only form of prayer that Jesus had bequeathed to the church being the ever-memorable form known as The Lord's Prayer. Little by little, however, as the churches grew in numbers and influence, both parts of Christian worship, the service of common prayer and instruction, which took shape largely from the synagogue service, and the sacramental portion of worship, which necessarily embodied much of the spirit of the serv-

ice of the temple, became more elaborate. The psalms and brief doxologies of the one, and the prayers and thanksgivings of the other, broadened into the various liturgical systems of the East and the West. These primitive liturgies Mr. Palmer, in his "*Origines Liturgicæ*," reduces to four: the great Oriental Liturgy, in use from the Euphrates and from the Hellespont to the southern extremity of Greece; the Alexandrian, used in Egypt, Abyssinia, and the country from the Mediterranean Sea to the west; the Roman, in use in Italy, Sicily, and the civil diocese of Africa; and the Gallican, used in Gaul, Spain, and probably Ephesus, until the fourth century. A book called "*The Apostolical Constitutions*," which originated in Syria in the latter part of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries, gives the common type to which the many later liturgies all conform, and after the fourth century we find these liturgies bearing the names of Apostles; thus the liturgy in use at Jerusalem is ascribed to St. James, that of Alexandria to St. Mark, that of Rome to St. Peter, and that of Milan to St. Barnabas.

From this it will be seen that there was no

law binding the churches of the early centuries to one universal form of worship, but rather that each church claimed the right to make its own; nevertheless, as any one who studies these primitive liturgies will see, they are pervaded by a common spirit, and alike manifest the instinct common to all nations and races to make public worship dignified and reverent, and to express their sense of religion by means of fitting words and symbols.

The liturgy of the ancient British Church, before the Anglo-Saxon invasion, belongs, according to one classification of the early liturgies, to a group named after St. John, and, at any rate, differs considerably from that in use at Rome. In the seventh century, however, sixty-eight years after the beginning of Augustine's mission in Britain, although absolute uniformity in public worship was not secured, the Roman came generally into use, and thus originated the various Service Books afterwards used in Britain: the Breviary, containing the order for Daily Service, the Missal, containing the Communion Service, compiled about the middle of the fifth century, the Antiphonary, the Benedictional, the Collectorium, the Epistolarium,

the Pontifical, the Manual or Ritual, and the Book of the Hours.

After the Norman Conquest in 1078-99, Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, undertook the revision of these Service Books, and henceforth the Breviary and Missal of Sarum, or according to the use of Sarum, became practically the liturgy of the Anglo-Norman Church.¹ But in the 16th century the deeply rooted and steadily growing discontent with the prevailing religious order showed itself, among other ways, in a petition of Convocation to the king for the appointment of a committee to reform the Ritual and Offices of the Church. Accordingly, in 1545, an English Service Book called the King's Primer appeared, which contained the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Venite, the Te Deum, and other hymns and collects, "several of them," Wheatley says, "in the same version in which we now use them."

In Edward VI.'s reign, late in 1547, an English Communion Service was prepared, and

¹ There were still other *Uses*, however, in the dioceses of Lincoln, Hereford, York, and Bangor. All these *Uses*, or Service Books, were, of course, in Latin.

during the next year the complete Prayer Book of Edward VI. was compiled by thirteen eminent divines, among whom were Cranmer and Ridley, the latter burned at Oxford in Queen Mary's reign, October 16, 1555, the former March 21, 1556. This book, to which most of the above-mentioned Latin Service Books contributed, after being duly approved by Parliament, came into general use on Whitsunday, June 9, 1549; and by comparing it with the earlier Books of Worship, we shall find that Morning and Evening Prayer were simplified from the Breviary, that the Communion Office with Collects, Epistles, and Gospels was a translation and adaptation of the Missal, and that the occasional Offices represented the Manual or Ritual, while those of Ordination and Confirmation were taken with modifications from the Pontifical. We shall find, likewise, how many objectionable things in the earlier liturgy, such as Litanies to Mary, and fictitious matter relating to Saints, were wisely thrown aside by the Reformers.

The feeling of hostility toward Rome had grown so rapidly that this Book did not long satisfy the popular demand for a liturgy more

in harmony with the spirit of primitive Christianity. Accordingly, Archbishop Cranmer, with the aid of Martin Bucer, a German, and Peter Martyr, an Italian Protestant, both learned men, reviewed it, adding the Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution; and omitting some things such as Prayers for the Dead,¹ and a few Rubrics. This Book was confirmed by Parliament in 1551, and an Act of Uniformity passed in April, 1552, directed its general use. But it is not known that Convocation sanctioned it, and it was probably never generally adopted.

King Edward died July 6, 1553, and Queen Mary restored the Latin Missal; but after her death in November, 1558, her sister Elizabeth, desiring to restore the English Service and "to unite the nation in one faith," ordered a review of the two Prayer Books of Edward's reign. Two of the ten divines chosen to carry out this revision were Matthew Parker afterward, and Edmund Grindall then, Archbishop

¹ These Prayers for the Dead, which many persons in the Church now desire to have restored, were contained in the Communion Service and in the Burial Office. One of the omitted Rubrics was that directing the mixing of water with wine at the time of the celebration of Holy Communion.

of Canterbury, and the result of the reviewers' work was the restoration of substantially the second Book of Edward VI.'s reign, for this Book, rather than the *first*, was taken as the basis of their work, and the changes made in it were very few. It came into use the 24th of June, 1559, and from this time onward the English Prayer Book received few alterations. In 1663, the first year of the reign of James I., a few slight changes were made, and later, in the reign of Charles II., a few more, and so, with the generally desirable, yet as regards the substance of the liturgy, unimportant changes made by the American Church in 1789, the Book of Common Prayer has come to us.

This, in brief outline, is the history of the Prayer Book as a whole, and when we come to a consideration of its details, we shall see at how many points it touches the history of Religion. We read the Psalter and are carried back to the Hebrew Temple service centuries before Christ, when the same psalms were chanted responsively by the Hebrew congregations. The Venite of our Morning Prayer (the 95th Psalm) takes us back not only to the primitive liturgies of the East and West, but to the

Jewish Feast of Tabernacles, for which it was perhaps originally composed. The Te Deum, which is, at least, 1500 years old, brings us face to face with Ambrose and the baptism of Augustine. The Benedicite, "O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord," was an ancient hymn in the Jewish Church, and was sung by the early Christians. The Apostles' Creed, the Creed in its Western form, introduces us to the simple, uncontroversial faith of primitive Christianity. The Nicene Creed, the Creed in its Eastern form, recalls the most dignified and most important General Council of the Church. The Lord's Prayer and the Gospels bring us face to face with our Lord himself. The Collect for Peace in the Morning and Evening Prayer comes from the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, an early and eminent Bishop of Rome, and is also associated with Augustine's mission to Britain. The Collect for the Clergy and People comes likewise from Gregory's ancient Prayer Book, and has been used in the Church of England for more than 1200 years. The prayer of St. Chrysostom brings before us that ancient Greek pulpit orator in his church at Constantinople, since it is from the liturgy that

bears his name. Part of the Gloria in Excelsis is ascribed to Telesphorus, who is supposed to have composed it about the year 137. The Litany marks one of the most important epochs in general history, the time when in the Roman Empire, tottering to its fall, the terror inspired by the invasions of hordes of Barbarians was increased by droughts, pestilences, and earthquakes, and the Church itself was rent by fierce internal strifes. In the open streets and fields of France, the centre of these disorders, it is said the first Litany was sung or shouted by terror-stricken multitudes, who hoped thus to avert the judgments of God. In the light of its origin we can understand those strong expressions : *the offences of our forefathers ; lightning and tempest ; plague, pestilence, and famine ; battle and murder and sudden death ; desolate and oppressed ; troubles and adversities.* Most of the Collects are very ancient, having been framed probably by St. Jerome (who selected also the Epistles and Gospels as they now stand), and then put in order and increased by Gelasius, a Bishop of Rome in the fifth century, and later revised by Pope Gregory the Great in the year 600 ; while some

alterations in them date, with the Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution, to the time of the Reformation. To the Great Bible of Tyndale, Coverdale, and Cranmer, of 1535-1540, rather than to the Version of King James, of 1611, or the Bishop's Bible, of 1571, we may trace our Prayer Book Psalter. The Offertory Sentences are not from any recognized version, but were probably translated by Cranmer, as also the Benedictus, Magnificat, and Nunc Dimittis. The Epistles and Gospels are from King James' Version, while the Psalms sung regularly in Morning and Evening Prayer agree in the main with the Great Bible. Dean Stanley eloquently says: "The Prayer Book, as it stands, is a long gallery of ecclesiastical history, which, to be understood and enjoyed thoroughly, absolutely compels a knowledge of the greatest events and names of all periods of the Christian Church. To Ambrose we owe the present form of our Te Deum; Charlemagne breaks the silence of our ordination prayers by the Veni Creator Spiritus. The persecutions have given us one Creed, and the Empire another. The name of the first great Patriarch of the Byzantine Church (Chrysostom) closes

our daily service ; the Litany is the bequest of the first great Patriarch of the Latin Church (Gregory) amidst the terrors of the Roman pestilence. Our Collects are the joint production of the Fathers, the Popes, and the Reformers. Our Communion Service bears the traces of every fluctuation of the Reformation through the two extremes of the reign of Edward to the conciliating policy of Elizabeth, and the reactionary zeal of the Restoration. The more comprehensive, the more free, the more impartial is our study of ecclesiastical history, the more it will be in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Church of England.”¹

This, then, is the *Prayer Book* used in every church of the Anglican faith and order throughout Christendom. It is inevitable that a book with such a history should reflect phases of thought and feeling that the world for the time, and perhaps forever, has outgrown, and should contain words and phrases now become obsolete. And it is quite as impossible that it should conform solely to the experience of any one age or phase of thought. In studying it we must not allow our minds to be diverted

¹ Eastern Church, chap. ii., p. 60.

from its essential principles and its leading purpose, to any mere technicality of expression or phrase that may seem ambiguous. Spiritual birth and death and resurrection, humiliation and triumph, self-sacrifice and reconciliation with God, the true relation of temporal and eternal, human and divine,—these are the essential truths of the Book of Common Prayer. And all these vital truths expressed in the seasons of the Church Year group themselves around the great doctrine of all true religious thought, the doctrine of the Incarnation. In that doctrine of *God in humanity*, lie the germs that have expanded into the various forms of common prayer and praise, the Sacramental liturgy, and the occasional Offices. From it, as the central doctrine of all devotional thought and life, come the observances of Advent and Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Easter, Whitsuntide, and Trinity,—all commemorative of that life that forever stands as the type of the life of humanity, the Christ in his headship of the body of which we are members.

For us who believe in prayer as the instinctive utterance of the heart, who are content to pray without necessarily framing a doctrine of

prayer, what words can be found more simple, more comprehensive, more tender, than the words of our Collects. How direct and natural are the prayers for light and guidance, for the increase of faith, hope, and charity, for defence against dangers temporal and spiritual, for right judgment in all the affairs of life, and for steadfastness in the way of truth. And how broad and rational is the underlying spirit of the Prayer Book. In the familiar Collect for Peace it recognizes most fully that "all holy desires, all good counsels, all just works" proceed from the inspiration of God. Following the teaching of Jesus and Paul, it declares that "all our doings without charity are nothing worth." Where it has one expression that would seem to make salvation in anywise dependent upon metaphysical or doctrinal rectitude, like Christ's own teachings, it has a hundred testifying to the supreme importance of righteous life. Its Creeds are catholic as truth itself, its doctrine of the Church is not limited by the accidents or expedients of a single age or intellectual condition.¹ It not only embodies the divine rich-

¹"The mystical body of Thy Son, *which is the blessed company of all faithful people*."—Service for Holy Communion.

ness of the words of Christ, but it reflects the inspired zeal of St. Paul, the love of St. John, the fervor of St. Peter, the catholicity of Athanasius, the vast learning of the most gifted of the Fathers—Origen, the eloquence of the golden-mouthed Chrysostom, the logic of Augustine, the wisdom of Cranmer and his fellow-workers; and among its sacred associations are enshrined the devotion and faith, the prayers and tears and sufferings of Apostles and Martyrs, holy women and Christ-like men, that whole vast company “who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labors.”

And when we remember, as we all should, that long ago, our own forefathers in England, in their times of joy or sorrow, of peace or penitence, as they knelt together in the churches of the motherland, used the same Collects, sang the same Te Deum, offered the petitions of the same Litany, and thus expressed emotions of religious joy or sorrow, identical with those that we their children feel, how incomparably sacred must the English Prayer Book seem. Our ritual, in grandeur and impressiveness, is far below that of ancient Faiths

like those of Assyria or Egypt ; and indeed in perfection of religious art, no *Reformed Church* can compare with the Church of Rome, but taken all in all, what service speaks so directly to the heart, or so simply and fittingly expresses the Religion of mankind, the primitive Faith of the Church, founded by our Divine Master, as the service of the English Book of Common Prayer. The failure to appreciate its merits among people of Puritan descent, a mistake that is necessarily fast curing itself, is due, not, as many have supposed, to the possession of more vital piety or more rational beliefs by people who use no Book of Prayer, but to that spirit of excessive protest, which led the Puritans in England and America into fanatical intolerance of much that the wisest minds in all ages have loved and upheld.¹

The liturgy of the Prayer Book is not per-

¹ No movement to me is more interesting than that of the return in our day of so many of the children of the Puritan Separatists to the ancient Church and her liturgy. For ten centuries and more our ancestors sang the same hymns, prayed the same prayers, knelt at the same altars, and whenever the religious horizon widens, and the narrowness of present sect limitations appears, we seem to turn as if by natural instinct to the familiar ways which through mistaken conviction those ancestors left only a few generations ago.

fect, but its spirit is in harmony with the leading idea of our Church, which is that of religious *education*, and to him who uses it, it becomes ever, insensibly, more and more sacred and dear. There are times when extemporaneous prayers may be necessary or at least desirable, but there can be little doubt that the liturgical instinct which has expressed itself in all great Faiths, demands for the permanent and abiding use of worship a well ordered and uniform ritual, and one which shall bear the impress, not of a single mind, but of many minds in many successive ages of religious thought and culture. As we have already said, modern extemporaneous worship receives no sanction from any of the great Faiths of the world, nor could it have been desired even by those ultra Protestants who have given the tone to much of modern Christianity, Calvin and John Knox, for both these men compiled for use in their day liturgies or Books of Common Prayer. Nor does it satisfy the better educated people of any denomination to-day. Whenever the spirit of religion has been broad and catholic, the value of historic liturgies has been felt, and now that the more enlightened people of mod-

ern sects have come into some comprehension of the largeness of Christianity, they feel the lack of catholicity, lack of dignity of their non-liturgical worship.

Little by little, especially among the children of the Puritans, worship, seeking forms that are adequate for its true expression, is turning itself into the well worn channels that the Catholic faith has made, is re-adopting the forms rendered sacred by nearly two thousand years of constant Christian use. The Prayer Book, both as a literary treasure and as the noblest manual of devotion in the English-speaking world, is one of the most valuable parts of our inheritance as children of the ancient Mother Church.

To its refining and spiritualizing influence the modern world now owes more than it can possibly understand, and as Christianity again returns to the spirit of the Christ and his Apostles, the ancient liturgy shall exert a still wider influence and secure the love of many hearts that have not yet entered into sympathy with its divine richness.

THE FUTURE LIFE.

“Death, if I am right, is, in the first place, the separation of two things, soul and body, nothing else. And after they are separated, they retain their several characteristics which are much the same as in life.”—PLATO, “Georgias.”

“This wonderfully woven life of ours shall not be broken by death in a single strand of it ; it shall run on and on, an unbroken life, upheld by the will of the Eternal.”—NEWMAN SMYTH.

“The desire of knowledge God has planted naturally in us, as hunger is natural in our bodies, or the want of light in our eyes. And the eye is not a more certain indication that light is to be given than our desire to know divine things is that we shall be permitted to know them.”—HORACE BUSHNELL.

“My mind can take no hold of the present world, nor rest in it for a moment, but my whole nature rushes on with irresistible force towards a future and better state of being.”—FICHTE.

“My own dim life should teach me this :
That life shall live forevermore ;
Else earth is darkness at the core,
And dust and ashes all that is.

“Thou wilt not leave us in the dust :
Thou madest man, he knows not why ;
He thinks he was not made to die ;
And thou hast made him : thou art just.”

—TENNYSON.

“It is in Heaven only that I find any basis for our poor pilgrimage on this earth.”—CARLYLE.

“When I consider the wonderful activity of the mind, so great a memory of what is past, and such a capacity of pene-

trating into the future ; when I behold such a number of arts and sciences, and such a multitude of discoveries thence arising, I believe and am firmly convinced that a nature which contains so many things within itself cannot be mortal.”—CICERO.

“ The seed dies into a new life, and so does man.”—GEORGE MACDONALD.

“ We are immortal. Death, as we call it, may touch our sensible vesture, but it is only a vesture which decays. Our being goes on in another life ; for we live in His life, and our true world is not this world. ‘ We look for a city which hath foundations.’ We abide in Him, and He in us, and He abides forever.

“ Does there seem to be a Spirit who leads us through life, conquering the years in us, redeeming us from all evil, bringing us calm out of sorrow, faith out of doubt, strength out of trial ? And when He has made us great of spirit like Himself, does He bury all that wealth of heart in nothingness ?

“ What incredible thing is this ? Only credible if there be no God.”—STOPFORD BROOKE.

“ I do not know whether I shall live again on earth or elsewhere ; whether I shall be a being of three dimensions or four, or of no dimensions at all ; whether I shall be in space or out of space. It is far better to give up speculations about accidental trifles, such as these ; for accidents they are, as compared with the essence of the second life, which consists in Love.”—EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

“ Then climb and climb forever toward the day,
And fear not thou shalt miss the one true way.”

—SAMUEL GREG.

THE FUTURE LIFE.

The question of a future life, in its religious or its speculative aspect, is of the greatest interest to every intelligent mind. We have so insatiable a craving for immortality, and are so frequently reminded of the brevity of this life, that we cannot get thoughts of the future far away from us if we would. And in most minds, could we know them well, there are, no doubt, the same questionings and balancings of probabilities regarding the condition of the future life, if there be any, that we are so familiar with in ourselves. Shall we continue to exist when we have closed our eyes upon this world, and, if so, how closely shall the life beyond resemble, or how far differ from, that we are living now? To the first of these questions, many of the most enlightened minds have felt obliged, from all they knew of God and man, to answer, Yes. To the second, the wisest men have never tried to give a very

definite answer, and the two Creeds of Catholic Christendom which distinctly affirm belief in the fact of future existence are utterly silent as to its precise conditions.

We are, however, perfectly familiar with the ideas of the future that were common in the Calvinistic churches a little while ago, but of late have almost disappeared throughout New England,—ideas which, based on the most literal views of the Bible, shaped themselves into crude and sensuous doctrines of *heaven and hell*. The sermons of Jonathan Edwards, preached in Northampton 150 years ago, present these doctrines in their naked deformity, and shall stand perhaps to all time as the finest testimony in Calvinistic literature to the want of imagination and failure to comprehend the Bible's true character of the Calvinistic mind.

But we must not blame the Calvinists as if they alone were responsible for the crude popular theories of the future held in past times. Dante's "Inferno," as well as Milton's "Paradise Lost," portrayed for the world a "mapped and measured" heaven and hell; Chrysostom, as well as Jonathan Edwards, depicted the torments of the lost and the joys of the saved in

language full of gross, material figures. Indeed the Calvinists inherited much that was worst in all their theology from the Mediæval Church.

In his recent book, "The Destiny of Man," Mr. John Fiske has shown that the Doctrine of Development, as expounded by Mr. Darwin and Mr. Herbert Spencer, in its relation to man, almost necessarily implies higher ranges of existence, in which his being shall have room to perfect itself. From the nature of the case, he argues, scientific demonstration of future existence is out of the question, since we cannot test the matter except by dying, but equally impossible is scientific demonstration of *no* future life, and "he who regards Man as the consummate fruition of creative energy, and the chief object of Divine care, is almost irresistibly driven to the belief that the soul's career is not completed with the present life upon earth. . . . From the first dawning of life we see all things working together toward one mighty goal, the evolution of the most exalted spiritual qualities which characterize humanity. . . . Are Man's highest spiritual qualities, into the production of

which all this creative energy has gone, to disappear with the rest? Has all this work been done for nothing? Is it all ephemeral, all a bubble that bursts, a vision that fades? Are we to regard the Creator's work as like that of a child, who builds houses out of blocks, just for the pleasure of knocking them down? For aught that science can tell us, it may be so, but I can see no good reason for believing any such thing. On such a view the riddle of the universe becomes a riddle without a meaning. Why, then, are we any more called upon to throw away our belief in the permanence of the spiritual element in Man than we are called upon to throw away our belief in the constancy of Nature?"

It is most certainly true that, whatever doubts may arise in individual minds concerning personal immortality, science has nothing to say against it, and when we consider the almost universal longing for it, the tendency of the race to believe in it, the affirmations of master minds like Plato's, Plutarch's, Montesquieu's, Emerson's — minds necessarily free from narrow religious bias of any sort; when we think of the latent capacities and powers of

man, of some of which we have as yet received only the feeblest intimations, of the marvellous spiritual grasp of his nature and the hunger of his soul for truth and perfect life ; when we remember how he can love and hate and pity and forgive ; how he can hope and enjoy and suffer, we cannot escape the conviction that a larger sphere must somewhere be appointed him, in which to work out a grander destiny than he ever approaches in his brief and limited career upon this earth. We might possibly think that the great dramatic purpose of God needed for its fulfilment that the temporary flame that burns in human souls should forever die and disappear, and that it was our duty to be willing to yield up our lives, and sink into nothingness, if so, God might be better glorified, were it not for all we have learned to believe, not only of His love and sympathy for us, but of the divine relationship between His intelligence and ours. When we examine our own thought, which we believe to be His thought in us, and find what it has to say concerning justice and righteousness and the enduring power of love, we are sure He has not raised us up to love and hate and hunger and grope

for light denied us, and in the height of the struggle to go down mocked and disappointed into everlasting unconsciousness. The soul, which is an effluence from Him, might at death, as many have believed, be swept back once more into Deity, if it were not that in projecting our souls into existence, He has chosen to give us each an identity as real as His own, and to make even the thought of non-existence as impossible to us as to Himself. We cannot think of ourselves as ceasing to exist. The effort to imagine ourselves dead, is always accompanied by the wider thought of ourselves as consciously alive to know that we are dead. We cannot get away from the belief in personal immortality, however we may try, or however loudly the voices of doubt and despondency within us may call to us to yield up our faith. And when to the revelation of eternal life given us by our own souls we add the calm and unwavering belief of Christ in the continuance of existence, we may well feel that but one answer can be given to the question so often and eagerly asked, "Does death end all?" The immortality we desire and have a right to expect is more than the resumption of our souls back into

Deity, more than the simple persistence of the life principle we possess through other forms of being, more than the mere immortality of our influence in the race, it is the continuance of conscious, personal existence for ever and ever.

The aged Victor Hugo expressed the confident belief of many of the maturest minds of the ages when he wrote :

“ I feel in myself the future life. I am like a forest which has been more than once cut down. The new shoots are stronger and livelier than ever. I am rising, I know, toward the sky. The sunshine is on my head. The earth gives me its generous sap, but heaven lights me with the reflection of unknown worlds.

“ You say the soul is nothing but the resultant of bodily powers. Why then is my soul the more luminous when my bodily powers begin to fail? Winter is on my head and eternal spring is in my heart. Then I breathe, at this hour, the fragrance of the lilacs, the violets, and the roses as at twenty years.

“ The nearer I approach the end the plainer I hear around me the immortal symphonies of the worlds which invite me. It is marvellous yet simple. It is a fairy tale, and it is history. For half a century I have been writing my thoughts in prose, verse, history, philosophy, drama, romance, tradition, satire, ode, song—I have tried all. But I feel that I have not said the thousandth part of what is in me.

“When I go down to the grave I can say, like so many others : ‘I have finished my day’s work’ ; but I cannot say : ‘I have finished my life.’ My day’s work will begin again the next morning. The tomb is not a blind alley ; it is a thoroughfare. It closes in the twilight to open with the dawn.

“I improve every hour because I love this world as my fatherland. My work is only a beginning. My monument is hardly above its foundation. I would be glad to see it mounting and mounting forever. The thirst for the infinite proves infinity.”

The common belief of Calvinism, based on a literal view of certain passages of Scripture, was not only that at death people went on living, but that they went on living under certain fixed and unalterable conditions ; conditions of material bliss or woe that should be the same millions of ages hence as they were the next moment after death. The two chief elements this doctrine contained, were the ideas of absolute stagnation of life in the world to come, and of endless duration. It is almost unnecessary to say that in whatever the New Testament says about the future life, the first of these ideas is not to be found at all, and the second, which Calvinism always made most prominent, is really incidental. Without discussing passages sepa-

rately, it may be stated that Christ in all his discourses used the familiar language of Jewish theology to impress on people's minds the profound truths he desired to make them feel. When he spoke of heaven and hell, of Abraham's bosom and paradise, it was not to map out and localize the future for the Jews to whom he spoke, but to make them feel the supreme importance of the *principles of righteousness*. The Jews in his time had a certain sensuous imagery under which no doubt the most enlightened of them concealed their true thought, but which to the mass of the people was exactly descriptive of the reality of the future life. The primitive Hebrew belief seems to have been that the spirits of those who died went indiscriminately into *sheol*, a vast subterranean tomb—the underworld,—with barred and bolted gates, where they lay silent like corpses. If there were distinctions there, they were not moral, but national or social, and to that underworld Jehovah's reign was believed not to extend. Thus the Psalmist says with true devotional feeling, and in protest against excluding God from any part of His universe: "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; *if I make*

my bed in hell, (sheol) behold thou art there." Later the belief seems to have grown up that from the dominion of death, the king of sheol, faithful Israelites should eventually be released, while the wicked and Gentiles should still be kept in the underworld. It was not until after the Exile, which terminated in the fifth century before Christ, that the belief grew up which seems to have become fully settled before Christ's time, that the unseen world comprised two distinct localities—a Paradise, and an Inferno, the *gehenna* of St. Matt. v., 22, 29, 30 ; x., 28 ; St. Mark ix., 43, 45, 47 ; St. Luke xii., 5 ; and a few other passages. In many places in the New Testament the word translated hell in the authorized version is the Greek word *hades*, which, like the Hebrew word sheol, means simply the underworld, and has no necessary connection with the thought of retribution.

The Book of Enoch, which originated in Palestine in the second century before Christ, and the second Book of Esdras (chap. ii., 19), describe Paradise as a restored Eden, where all is peace and prosperity, where there are mountains covered with lilies and roses, where milk and honey are plentiful, and as in the *Revela-*

tion, trees perpetually bear delicious fruits. Another figure under which the Hebrews described Paradise was that of a banquet with the Patriarchs and Prophets,¹ where reclining on couches some might even lean their heads on Abraham's bosom, than which, to a faithful Jew, no honor could be greater, no bliss more perfect. Correspondingly dreadful was their language concerning the abode of woe. They named it *gehenna*, or the valley of the sons of Hinnom, because in that valley, just outside the city walls, the offal from the Temple sacrifices and all sorts of rubbish were made to feed a fire that rarely, if ever, was suffered to go out. It was the perpetual abode of corruption and fire, and its ghastly associations supplied terrible images by which to describe the condition and the place of lost spirits. Indeed, in the lapse of time, it came to be regarded as one of the mouths of the pit of destruction itself. This will throw light on some of the strongly figurative language of the New Testament concerning the future life : Jesus, as we have seen, spoke to his people in their own language ; their familiar religious rites and doctrines he

¹ See St. Luke xiii., 29 ; xvi., 22.

did not assail, nor in enforcing truth upon them did he ignore their own metaphors. But it will be noticed that he uses Jewish figures only when talking to the Sanhedrin, or the High Priest, or Nathaniel, not when talking to the Roman governor, to whom Jewish figures would have had little meaning.

Thus we see the origin of certain opinions concerning the future life that have prevailed in the Christian Church. It is not necessary here to trace these in detail. According to the temper of theologians in the Early Church, and through the Middle Ages, belief in the future assumed a milder or more vindictive tone. Some believed in endless tortures for the wicked and endless bliss for the good; with some the hottest fires of perdition were reserved for morally wicked men, and with some, those whose thought deviated from established lines were to suffer the worst punishments. Some, like Origen, with a finer ethical sense and a truer belief in God, in the spirit of St. Paul¹ looked forward and prophesied the final

¹ See 1 Cor. xv., 22, 24-28; Romans viii., 21, 23; also Hebrews ii., 14. In the New Testament there are as many *texts* for the doctrine of the Restitution of all things as for any other doctrine of the future.

triumph of righteousness and peace. In the Early Church, the doctrine of an Intermediate State between this world and the final heaven and hell was commonly taught, a doctrine which afterward in the Middle Ages held its place as a belief in Purgatory, whose cleansing fires should make it possible for some of the many millions who had died impenitent or unbaptized to be purified and so at last reach heaven. In the later Calvinistic belief there was no such merciful provision, the soul at death being received at once into unending bliss, or driven into unending woe. Taine says of the Puritans: "The feeling of the difference there is between good and evil had filled for them all time and space, and had become incarnate and expressed for them by such words as Heaven and Hell," and as one can see from the writings of such men as Jonathan Edwards, no palliation of the sufferings themselves, nor shortening of their duration, was felt to be possible for "sinners in the hands of an angry God."

Under all these gross, mistaken conceptions of the future we may discern, however, the true principles Christ taught; of which our

Church, rational and moderate, by her refusal in all her history to adopt the Calvinistic language, and her little interest in current disputes concerning the state of the departed, teaches us chiefly to think.

Heaven and hell are states of the soul, not places of arbitrary reward and punishment. Jesus taught nothing concerning the objective conditions of the life beyond ; he did teach that obedience to God's laws brings life and immortality, that disobedience brings death, which is the loss of light and power. In this world and all worlds, it was the mission of his life to teach, righteousness redeems the soul, lifting it to heights of knowledge and peace it has not known before, while sin narrows the life and works therein confusion and dismay. No word has been more common in Christian speech than the word salvation, and no word has been more mistakenly or at least unintelligently used. To be saved, means to be undergoing that process of growth in knowledge and goodness, that leads gradually onward toward the state—for man never attainable—of absolute perfection ; to be lost, means to be slowly falling away from light and truth, to be going

downward not upward in the scale of being. When Jesus wept over Jerusalem and her unbelief, and bade the weary world before him drop its burdens and replace them with his easy yoke, or flee from wrath to come, he was not contemplating a lake of burning sulphur on the one hand and a paradise of sensual delight on the other, but rather the ruin of the moral nature, or the perfection of the life of man. With a power of spiritual vision that no other possessed, he looked into the soul of man and was filled with enthusiasm over its divine possibilities, or else with unutterable grief over its prophecies of ruin and decay ; and like all the greatest religious teachers, he sought to reveal to men the great unacknowledged fact of their sonhood of God, and so to make them conscious of the divine power within them by means of which they might rise superior to the limitations of sin and sense. His figurative language, which to later theologians seemed to imply that throughout unending ages men should remain just as this life left them, really implied endless expansion and growth. The word which in our authorized version is sometimes translated *eternal*, sometimes *everlasting*, contained, as Christ used

it, far more and other than the mere notion of endlessness of time. Eternal life was the freedom from *all* limitations that the soul gains by increased consciousness of God; eternal death was the loss of light and liberty, the narrowness and slavery of soul that comes when God is forgotten and His laws disobeyed. The essential idea in the word life is that of change: no living soul can stand still here or hereafter; nor in view of the instinctive belief in the triumphant power of goodness which has expressed itself in those passages of Scripture that speak of future redemption for the race, and the final conquest of the kingdoms of this world by God, and that every day finds expression in the devout hopefulness and cheerful prophecy of reverent minds, can we believe that sin and suffering are to go on in the universe forever.

Emerson quotes George Fox as saying: "There is an ocean of darkness and death, but withal an infinite ocean of light and love which flows over that of darkness," and this is the belief of healthy souls.

The problem of evil has always been regarded as insoluble on the theory of a perfect God, and

yet may we not be approaching an explanation of it when we think of "imperfection as in some sort essential to all that we know of life. Sign of life in a mortal body, sign of a state of progress, of change" ?¹ Cardinal Newman says very significantly: "The laws of the universe, the principles of truth, the relation of one thing to another, their qualities and virtues, the order and harmony of the whole, all that exists is from God; and if evil is not from Him, as assuredly it is not, this is because evil has no substance of its own, but is only the defect, excess, perversion, or corruption of that which has."² If, then, evil is the excess, negation, or wrong use of the good, its true corrective will be found, as in the universe, so in the individual life, in keeping all the factors of life in proper balance. To do less or more than law requires, to warp things from their proper uses, to give the lower the place of the higher, to make aims that are not the best life's chief aims, will assuredly result in evil. To observe the laws that God has affixed to the nature of things will

¹ John Ruskin.

² "Discourses on the Scope and Nature of University Education," pp. 91-97.

redeem the world and all its conscious life from death and despair.

“O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself,” says the Prophet Hosea, speaking for God, “but in Me is thy help,” and every soul in all the world that has learned that living for self means death, and living for God means life, has understood the double note of despondency and hope that sounds in the Prophet’s words: “God has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ.” Righteousness is more deeply rooted in our natures than sin; righteousness is our true life, sin is life’s contradiction; and it may be overcome. The Calvinistic view of man as naturally lost to God, may sometimes seem to be true, but it is not true. God’s erring children may be lost to themselves, but they can never be lost to Him.

We have dwelt thus, at length, on the nature of salvation, because right views of eternal life and death, fulfilment and destruction, are at the bottom of all true conceptions of the future. We do not know what the conditions of the future will be, what new bodies we shall wear, what new homes we shall live in, what new em-

ployments we shall have ; we only know that life means growth and development, and that eternity means freedom from the limitations of time and sense. "Where will you be then?" said some one once to Luther. "Under Heaven," he answered, and the words implied all that we mean when we talk about the impossibility of ever getting away from the divine presence, the divine love.

"Our joys are shaded. The perfect smile belongs to God alone."¹ Yet if, in other spheres, enlargement of spiritual life shall mean, as it must mean, the ever more and more perfect reflection in us of the perfect "smile" of God, all our vague dreams of Heaven shall be more than realized.

Hell is no longer to the enlightened Christian mind the gehenna of the Hebrews or the sulphureous lake of the Calvinistic creeds ; it is something far more terrible,—the corruption and narrowness and emptiness and loss of vital power of the retrograding soul.

Heaven is not pearls and flowers, and fruits and banquets, but something infinitely better and more to be desired,—enlargement of soul,

¹ Victor Hugo.

light, and liberty, and love ; “ That perfect presence of God’s face which we for want of words call Heaven.”

How shall we escape hell and gain Heaven ? By following conscience and true self-love, which, as Bishop Butler says, “ always lead the same way.”

“ Be docile to thine unseen Guide ;
Love Him as He loves thee :
Time and obedience are enough,
And thou a saint shalt be.”¹

¹ Faber.

THE END.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 022 255 0

